

VOLUME XLVII

*desk*

NUMBER 1

*January 1952*

---

# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

---

*A Quarterly Journal* devoted to re-  
search in the Languages, Literatures,  
History, and Life of Classical Antiquity

UNIVERSITY  
OF MICHIGAN

FEB 19 1952

PERIODICAL  
READING ROOM

---

THE UNIVERSITY of CHICAGO PRESS  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

## EDITORS

RICHARD TREAT BRÜERE, *Managing Editor*  
 BLANCHE BEATRICE BOYER  
 OSCAR BRONEER  
 CARL DARLING BUCK  
 BENEDICT EINARSON  
 GERTRUDE SMITH  
 FRANKLIN P. JOHNSON  
 JAKOB A. O. LARSEN  
 RICHARD P. MCKEON  
 RALPH MARCUS

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FREDERICK MALCOLM COMBELLACK, *University of Oregon*  
 PHILLIP HOWARD DE LACY, *Washington University*  
 AUBREY DILLER, *Indiana University*  
 ROBERT J. GETTY, *University of Toronto*  
 WILLIAM CHASE GREENE, *Harvard University*  
 GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON, *Yale University*

VOL. XLVII CONTENTS FOR JANUARY 1952 No. 1

|   |                         |    |
|---|-------------------------|----|
| The Enquête on Seneca's Treason . . . . .                         | William Hardy Alexander | 1  |
| Cyrene and the Panhellenion . . . . .                             | J. A. O. Larsen         | 7  |
| The Lion in the House ( <i>Agamemnon</i> 717-36 [Murray]) . . . . | Bernard M. W. Knox      | 17 |
| Notes and Discussions . . . . .                                   |                         | 26 |

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH: On "Triballio" in Aristophanes (*Birds* 1615).—G. D. PERCY: Note on Lucan 7. 257-58.—C. ARTHUR LYNCH: Aeschylus *Agamemnon* 550.—C. ARTHUR LYNCH: Aeschylus *Agamemnon* 286.—J. F. GILLIAM: Notes on *PSI* 1307 and 1308.

## Book Reviews 32

ANTONY E. RAUBITSCHKE and LILIAN H. JEFFERY (eds.): *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis: A Catalogue of the Inscriptions of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B.C.* (McGregor).—DAVID GRENE: *Man in his Pride: A Study of the Political Philosophy of Thucydides and Plato* (Ehrenberg).—ENZO V. MARMORALE (ed.): *Naevius poeta: Introduzione bibliografica, testo dei frammenti e commento* (Brüere).—EDUARD SCHWYZER and ALBERT DEBRUNNER: *Griechische Grammatik, Zweiter Band: Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik* (Whatmough).—MARTIN P. NILSSON: *The Minoan-Mycenaean Religion and its Survival in Greek Religion* (Walton).—PIERRE AMANDRY: *La mantique orphique à Delphes: Essai sur le fonctionnement de l'Oracle* (Walton).—PHOTÉINE P. BOUREOULIS: *Apollo Delphikos* (Walton).—ETTORE PARATORE: *Storia della letteratura latina* (Brüere).—FRANCO CARBATA: *Cultura greca e unità macedone nella politica di Filippo II* (Roebuck).—M. P. CHARLES-WORTH: *The Lost Province or the Worth of Britain* (Roebuck).—BARBARA KRYSINIEL-JOZEFOWICZ: *De quibusdam Plauti exemplaribus Graecis: Philemo—Plautus* (Hough).—FRITZ WEHRLI (ed.): *Die Schule des Aristoteles: Texte und Kommentar, Heft V: Straton von Lampakos* (De Lacy).—MARIO ATTILIO LEVI: *Nerone e i suoi tempi* (Salmon).—CORNELIS BAREND SNELLER: *De Rhese tragoedia* (Grube).—M. SCHUSTER (ed.): *Catulli Veronensis liber* (Clausen).—RUDOLF BULTMANN: *Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der antiken Religionen* (Shepherd).—A. BOUYER (ed. and trans.): *César, Guerre d'Afrique* (Townsend).—GEORGE E. MCCracken (ed. and trans.): *Arnobius of Sicca: The Case against the Pagans* (Van Sickle).—ALFRED KLOTZ (ed.): *C. Iuli Caesaris commentarii, Vol. II: Commentarii belli civilis* (Bassett).—HETTY GOLDMAN (ed.): *Excavations at Gösta Kule, Tarsus, Vol. I: The Hellenistic and Roman Periods* (Waage).

## Books Received 63

Communications for the editors and manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor of Classical Philology, Box I, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill. All manuscripts must be typed, double spaced—both texts and notes—with ample margins on firm paper (not onion-skin, etc.).

Classical Philology is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October, by the University of Chicago at the University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Ave., Chicago 37, Illinois. Subscriptions are by volume only. The subscription price is \$6.00 per volume; the price of single issues is \$1.75. Orders for service of less than a full volume will be charged at the single issue rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States and its possessions. No extra charge for countries in the Pan American Postal Union. Postage is charged extra as follows: for Canada and Newfoundland, 20 cents per volume (total \$6.20), 5 cents per issue (total \$1.80); for all other countries in the Postal Union, 50 cents per volume (total \$6.50), 10 cents per issue (total \$1.85). Subscriptions are payable in advance. Please make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in United States currency or its equivalent by postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following is an authorized agent:

For the British Empire except North America and Australasia: CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Bentley House, 200 Euston Road, London, N.W. 1, England. Prices of subscriptions and of single copies may be had on application.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 37, Ill.

Applications for permission to quote from this journal should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, and will be freely granted.

Microfilms of this journal are available to regular subscribers only and may be obtained at the end of the volume year. Orders and inquiries should be addressed to University Microfilms, 313 North First Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Notice to subscribers: If you change your address, please notify us and your local postmaster immediately.

Entered as second-class matter June 20, 1906, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in United States Postal Act of October 3, 1917, Section 1103, amended February 28, 1925, authorized June 6, 1918.

7  
-

ity

-

1

-

1

7

7

26

2

3

-

6

-

1

-

1

-

1

W

V

th  
er  
re  
be  
an  
un  
cer  
ne  
pl  
ca  
bu  
sw  
in  
ag  
fo  
th  
in  
ha  
th  
(5

be  
pr  
of  
no  
be  
ill,  
str  
cli  
if

[C



# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XLVII

JANUARY 1952

Number 1

## THE ENQUÊTE ON SENECA'S TREASON

WILLIAM HARDY ALEXANDER

WITH the forty-eighth chapter of *Annals* 15 Tacitus begins the narrative of the suppression of the conspiracy of Piso. At chapter 59 entries commence in the gory death-register. Gaius Piso, the prospective beneficiary of the plot, is the first victim and Plautius Lateranus, sturdy and unflinching patriot, the second (60.2).<sup>1</sup> "Then came the death of Annaeus Seneca (60.3), a source of unbounded pleasure to Nero, not because he had caught him red-handed in conspiracy, but that he might assail him with the sword, since the poison cup had proved ineffective (45.5-6)." The proceedings against Seneca were taken on the information of Antonius Natalis alone; this man had been an intimate of Piso in all particulars (50.1) and seems to have acted as the peripatetic agent of the singularly ill-handled conspiracy (54.1).

What information had Natalis laid before "the innermost cabal of the prince in his brutalities," as the phrase of Tacitus runs (60.4)? It amounted to no more than this (*hactenus*): "he had been sent by Piso to Seneca, who was ill, to pay him a visit and to register a strong complaint about his having declined to receive Piso; it would be better if they maintained their friendship on

the basis of an easy coming and going." Seneca had replied that exchange of sentiments and frequent interviews served no good purpose for either of them; *ceterum salutem suam incolumitate Pisonis inniti* (60.4-5). Evidently on these words the interview had ended. It may surely be assumed that as from one who, though he had been "prime minister" of the Empire, was yet of equestrian origin, there would be employed towards Piso, an aristocrat of the noblest descent and of the highest popular reputation (48.2), whatever his failings (48.4), a terminal formula of careful politeness.

Holbrooke observed long since<sup>2</sup> that the words *ceterum . . . inniti* resembled somewhat the stylized greeting *si tu vales, ego quoque valeo* with which letters exchanged between Cicero and great Republican dignitaries usually began; the practice was pretty much out of fashion in Seneca's time, though it had died hard.<sup>3</sup> Furneaux in Volume I of his great edition of the *Annals* (footnote *ad loc.*), commenting on Holbrooke's idea, says that the words in question, no matter what use (or misuse) of them was subsequently made "may not have been more than a warm expression of friendship." As a matter of fact there is no need to feel that they

were even that. In the formulas employed today in the termination of letters, especially in continental European usage, no friendship, warm or otherwise, is implied; they are rhetorical expansions of our "yours truly" or even "very sincerely yours."

Yet it is possible that the words *ceterum . . . inniti* are not simply a formal compliment addressed by Seneca to Piso at a moment when the close relations of an earlier day had to be denied continuance; that was surely a moment when the language employed might very well be designed to avoid rather than to make use of the commonplaces of social intercourse, to exhibit significance, in short, Seneca may, in that light, even be thought of as felicitating himself on having achieved a good turn of language here, the wording of which has been preserved with scrupulous fidelity by the historian in the record. How ironical it would seem (and what irony of situation did Tacitus ever miss?) if the phrase on which conviction of high treason was finally made to rest in Seneca's case, was actually a careful turn of language composed by the highest ranking master of expression in those days; that, in short, Seneca was in the end caught, no matter how unfairly, in a verbal net of his own weaving! Or, if that is putting it too strongly, how ironical to be caught just in a phrase of high courtesy! Tacitus, as ironist, could well be satisfied with either.

We have been assuming up to this point that Seneca did in fact make the remark *ceterum . . . inniti*, as Natalis maintained. But it must now be reported that this is denied, if not by Seneca (of which more later), at all events by Jackson in a footnote to the passage 60.6 in the Loeb *Tacitus*,<sup>4</sup> where he is referring to Seneca's reply

to the question propounded by Nero and his advisers and conveyed to Seneca at his villa near Rome by the military tribune Gavius Silvanus, namely: *an dicta Natalis suaque responsa nosceret*, where *dicta . . . responsaque* means "the words used by Natalis [at the interview with Seneca on the subject of Piso] and Seneca's own reply." Says Jackson: "Seneca denies the possibility of his having said *salutem suam incolumitate Pisonis inniti*: — He cannot have made the remark in earnest, for the only person whose safety he ranks above his own is the emperor: he cannot have made it out of empty civility, for such compliances are alien to his nature." The matter of "empty civility" we have already discussed; as for Seneca denying the possibility, it would be more accurate to say that Seneca, while not denying the possibility of his having used the words *ceterum . . . inniti*, seeks to create the impression of the improbability of his having done so, which is quite another story. To this we shall return later.

Here too it may be recalled that René Waltz, illustrious student of Seneca's life and character, has written as follows in relation to the incident:<sup>5</sup>

"Sénèque reconnu qu'ayant refusé d'admettre Pison chez lui, il avait reçu à ce sujet la visite de Natalis, mais *nia l'exactitude des paroles qu'on lui prêtait*. D'après Natalis, Sénèque avait dit que sa vie reposait sur le salut de Pison, *salutem suam incolumitate Pisonis inniti*; Sénèque le *démentit formellement* et fit ressortir l'in-vraisemblance du propos." (The italics in the French are mine.)

Waltz cannot, however, demonstrate the truth of either of these italicized statements, especially the second of them, from the account given by Tacitus. That Seneca did his best in answering the tribune to give his conclud-

ing remark in the interview with Natalis an "invraisemblance" is correct enough, not however so far as concerns the actuality of the remark but rather of the construction Nero was putting upon it, namely, that of high treason. Tacitus has not denied (and it would have been so easy to do so immediately after the first sentence of 61) *negavit se umquam dixisse salutem suam etc.* He merely shows us Seneca endeavoring to make the concluding remark of the interview as attributed to him by Natalis and *not denied by himself* appear ridiculously inflated in respect of (a) material for a charge of treason<sup>6</sup> or (b) an accusation of special regard for Piso. Waltz does not come off any better than Jackson in the face of the Tacitean narrative.

Seneca's answer to the question brought him by the tribune consists (61.1-3) of the following items: (a) by way of *acknowledgment*: that Natalis had been sent to him by Piso; that Natalis had registered a complaint in Piso's name against his being refused admission to Seneca's presence; that he, Seneca, had put forth as his reason for such refusal his poor health and desire for (scholarly?) repose; (b) by way of *implication*, since it is not specifically denied, though, in fact, adumbrated by a rhetorical replacement: that he had, in concluding the interview, sent a word of greeting to Piso by Natalis. As has been said above, and it will bear repeating here, Seneca seeks to create an impression of the improbability of his having said *ceterum . . . inniti*; he does not *deny* having said it or something like it. The problem before him was actually that of finding a method of dealing with the fatal words in such a way as to take out of them, if anyone persisted in maintaining that they had been said, the peril now re-

cognized by him to be involved in them.<sup>7</sup>

Ramsay, the able translator of the *Annals*,<sup>8</sup> in a footnote on *cur salutem . . . anteferet? nec sibi promptum in adulationes ingenium* (61.3), is surprisingly downright in his explanation of what those words signify: "what Seneca means is that the words of his message to Piso were to be taken in their natural courtesy meaning and that they were not intended to convey any special compliment to Piso, as though his safety were a matter of particular consequence to himself." It never seems to have entered Ramsay's mind that Seneca denied, in effect, as a fourth item in his reply to the tribune, having used the language *ceterum . . . inniti*, or at least claimed that he had been misrepresented. I fear that this attitude assumes more than anyone has any right to assume; this will forthwith be made to appear.

From the form of Seneca's statement *cur salutem . . . non habuisse*, "I have had no reason for preferring the health of any ordinary person [i. e., of any person other than the emperor] above my own well-being," it would seem that Seneca was deliberately confusing the issue — excellent tactics in a summary trial where the dice are all loaded against you and where bitter enemies form the bench. His words may imply that he wishes to represent himself as possibly having made to Natalis the statement *ceterum incolumitatem suam salute Pisonis inniti*, with the two abstract nouns inversely placed as compared with their position in Natalis' report: "however, his well-being depended on the good health of Piso." This, of course, produces an intolerable flattery, as he proceeds to add, the flattery of preferring the mere health (*salus*) of a private citizen to his own

all-around well-being (*incolumitas*), and surely no one could suspect him of grossness of adulation to that extent, Nero least of all. The choice is thus offered Nero and his associate judges between *ceterum salutem suam incolumitate Pisonis inniti* as reported by Natalis and *ceterum incolumitatem suam salute Pisonis inniti* as inferable by indication from Seneca's own statement in dealing with this item.

There can be no doubt which they preferred. *Incolumitas* was in those days developing a special sense in relation to the emperor, "the health, wealth, and prosperity [of the sovereign]."<sup>9</sup> Compare for this sense 14.57.2 where Tigellinus is addressing Nero: *non se, ut Burrum, diversas spes sed solam incolumitatem Neronis spectare*. A man may talk about his own *incolumitas* and be profoundly interested in it; he has two recognized loyalties, one to himself and his own *incolumitas*, another, far above that, to the *incolumitas* of the sovereign. But when he speaks about his *salus* being conditioned by the *incolumitas* of any person other than the emperor, he has introduced a third *incolumitas* (Piso's in this case), and this is a challenge to the *incolumitas* of the prince himself. But this is high treason.

Therefore the form of the *ceterum . . . inniti* sentence as reported by Natalis is the form required by Nero and his *consilium* for getting on promptly with the business of eliminating Seneca under the charge of high treason. Furthermore, returning now to the earlier paragraphs of this paper, I feel sure that it was the form of statement actually employed by Seneca and that he designed it purely as a compliment to Piso without thinking through to a conclusion the possible consequences, under any conditions whatever, of the association of his *salus* with an *in-*

*columitas* linked to Piso's name, and, of course, without ever realizing the slant that would presently be given such an association under the special circumstances attending the discovery of the conspiracy. After all, the remark was made in conversation; it was not a written pronouncement. I regard Seneca's attempt to sidestep the issue by assuming a transposition of the abstract nouns in the compliment to Piso as rather pitiable and as constituting clear evidence that, in effect, he admitted the charge of which Waltz says, most inexplicably, as already reported: "Sénèque le démentit formellement." Seneca did send the message of respect to Piso which Natalis reported, and no doubt thought of it at the time as a sound formula of respect. Facing the tribune and the blunt questions he conveyed, he saw it from quite another angle; there is death in the phrase *incolumitate Pisonis inniti*. Unfortunately for Seneca these words were ambiguous enough in the circumstances to permit them to be construed as implying some kind of partnership in the Pisonian conspiracy; the language would not have to be too precise to furnish what Nero and Poppaea and Tigellinus would consider evidence of the first quality. Even what they got was none too good, but it was something they had to use in default of better; Seneca was really *non coniurationis manifestus* (60.3).

Consider a present analogue for all this. In some modern country there is prevalent fear of a foe who is known to be working subversively from within. In these circumstances a certain citizen A is unfortunate enough to have had an acquaintance of long standing with another citizen B, now under condemnation, or virtually so, for treasonable communication with the potential enemy. In a fairly recent

period prior to B's condemnation a third party C, acquainted with them both, has been engaged in an attempt to open the way for a renewal of relations between A and B who have not for some time been on intimate terms. A replies to C by letter of which the conclusion is as follows: "I do not think that any useful ends for either B or me could be served by my making myself at home to any further social calls or the like by him upon me. However, please feel entitled to convey to him the assurance of my continued high personal regards." Presently the authorities discover questionable relations of C with B; the former, to gain himself some consideration, turns over to them, among other things, this letter to him from A on the subject of A's resuming friendly relations with B. How is A going to explain himself out of it? He has written his concluding sentence in a politeness largely formal, no doubt, using refined if stereotyped phraseology, but he will have difficulty *under the circumstances* in securing a nontreasonable construction for his courtesy. He may be as clever as Seneca in his attempted refutation but, things being as we have assumed them to be, it is not likely to save him. Of course there is the difference that in this supposed case writing is involved while in the Seneca affair it was a matter of verbal report; still, I think, the modern analogy is reasonably illuminating.

All the trouble that has arisen in the comments of editors and scholars on this passage has arisen, in my judgment, from the fact that these comments have

been made in happier times than those in which we now live when it is all too easy (or should be) to discern exactly how Seneca got enmeshed in the net of a charge of treason through a piece of what could certainly be defended as purely conventional politeness; further, because these comments have been made by persons who grew up and lived out their lives without ever being involved in a social and political setting electrically charged with hate and suspicion attending on every word and act of those dwelling and functioning in high places. The very moment that the circumstances of our own lives begin actively to resemble those attending on the Pisonian conspiracy, this passage from the *Annals* and others like it are apt to clear themselves up at once as if in a revealing flash; we are, in fact, left wondering why anyone was ever so simple-minded as to miss the point.

This is only another reminder that all sound commentary must be written, as nearly as possible, in strict integration with the times and the conditions prevailing when the original text was composed, or in times and conditions very like them. After all, Tacitus had lived through the horror of Domitian's reign. In other words, a good editor of a classical text must be able, imaginatively at least, to live in the circumstances of his author's period. If his own days present a set of circumstances resembling that prevailing in his author's day, he may be, and generally should be, greatly assisted by that fact.<sup>10</sup>

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

#### NOTES

1. The references of this type are to chapters and sections of *Ann.* 15 as given in the revision by Pelham and Fisher (Oxford, 1907) of Vol. II of H. Furneaux's *Annals of Tacitus* (Oxford, 1891).

2. G. A. Holbrooke (ed.), *The Annals of Tacitus* (London: Macmillans, 1882), p. 427, note.

3. See *Epistulae morales* 15.1; also W. C. Summers's note *ad loc.* in his *Select Letters of Seneca* (London: Macmillans, 1913).

4. John Jackson (trans.), *Tacitus: Annals*. ("Loeb Classical Library," 1937) IV, 313, note.

5. R. Waltz, *Vie de Sénèque* (Paris, 1909), p. 436.

6. "Der Gedanke an Hochverrat, der in dieser Antwort gefunden ist [i.e., *cur salutem...ingenium*] kommt ihm nicht, wenigstens thut er absichtlich so." A. Draeger (ed.), *Die Annalen des Tacitus* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1899), Vol. II, Part II, p. 95, note. The *wenigstens...so* is the important point. Seneca did not act or speak as one recognizing that treason was imputed, even though he knew well that it was. He affects to treat the point rather as one of personal *dignitas*.

7. There are four definite items in the information laid by Natalis (60.4-5); three of these are specifically and affirmatively dealt with by Seneca at the beginning of 61, but the reply to the fourth passes into the field of oblique or indirect handling. This really makes this fourth point stand out very sharply; it must have been very noticeable at the time.

8. G. G. Ramsay (trans.), *The Annals of Tacitus, Books XI-XVI: An English Translation* (London: Murray, 1909), p. 297, note.

9. This paper makes no attempt to discuss the similarity of meaning and the difference, if any, as between *salus*

and *incolumitas* in Tacitus' usage. This might well be worth an investigation. As *incolumitas* becomes so closely identified with the Caesar and all phases of his dignity, one may guess that it is a more comprehensive word. I have attempted to indicate this by the translation "health, wealth, and prosperity." In *Hist.* 1.66.1: *verba Fabii salutem incolumitatemque Viennensium commendantis* there seems to be a real difference; *salutem* refers to the lives of the inhabitants of Vienne and *incolumitatem* to their worldly goods and possessions. See G. A. Davies (ed.), *Histories, Book I, ad loc.* (Cambridge: Pitt Press Series, 1896).

10. B. W. Henderson, *The Life and Principate of the Emperor Nero* (London: Methuen, 1903), is, as far as I have been able to discover, the one Tacitean commentator who has detected some very peculiar implications in the passage I have examined above. He has stated rather summarily (p. 281) the ideas which I have attempted to work out in close detail. His whole paragraph is most informing, however, and deserves the closest reading and study, especially in regard to Seneca's relations with Piso in 62 (*Ann.* 14.65.2).



## CYRENE AND THE PANHELLENION

J. A. O. LARSEN

THE inscription from Cyrene recently published by P. M. Fraser and later discussed briefly by James H. Oliver<sup>1</sup> contains some references to the Cyrenaeans in connection with the Panhellenion. It includes several documents of which the first is a letter of A.D. 134/5 from Hadrian to the city of Cyrene, but so much of the inscription has been lost that scarcely a single sentence can be restored with certainty. Yet some conclusions can be drawn from it, both concerning the relation of Cyrene to the Panhellenion and concerning the nature of this organization.<sup>2</sup> It is fairly safe to conclude that Cyrene was admitted to membership, while the reference to the two *synedroi* helps to show that the states belonging to the Panhellenion did not all have a single vote each, but that the system of votes in proportion to population used in the later sympolities and *koina* was applied also to the Panhellenion.<sup>3</sup>

To begin with the admission of the Cyrenaeans to the Panhellenion, the very existence of the document should be sufficient proof, even though lines 9ff. have been thought — incorrectly in my opinion — to contain a challenge to the Hellenism of the Cyrenaeans. A city is not likely to perpetuate in a public place the record of a humiliation, of an unsuccessful effort to attain some dignity. If Fraser (p. 87) is right that the inscription we have is a third century copy, the case is strengthened considerably, for this effort to preserve the document shows that its contents were highly regarded.

In the second place, we have proof that the *synedrion* of the Panhellenes admitted certain cities that were not originally Hellenic but had been Hellenized later. Cibra was admitted, probably during the reign of Antoninus Pius, and her Hellenism cannot have been of long standing<sup>4</sup>. Magnesia on the Maeander was probably admitted during the same reign.<sup>5</sup> As to the Hellenism of the Magnesians, all that can be said here is that with their foundation legends they protest too much, and that it is doubtful that Herodotus regarded them as Greeks.<sup>6</sup> Moreover, among those members for which we do not have reports of action by the *synedrion*, there was at least one city of a non-Hellenic origin but later Hellenized, namely, Aezani, which belonged already under Hadrian, and probably also the old Lydian capital, Sardes,<sup>7</sup> not to speak of such a Hellenistic foundation or refoundation as Apamea-Celaenae. With these cities admitted, can we believe that an old Greek colony such as Cyrene was rejected? We do not know just how extensive or inclusive the Panhellenion was in practice, and so may imagine that Cyrene might never have been proposed for membership, but not that she was proposed and rejected. To be sure, the city had been liberal in its interpretation of citizenship and had permitted intermarriage with Libyans — in fact, the Ptolemaic *diagramma* of the late fourth century B.C. specifically provided that the mothers of citizens could be Libyans.<sup>8</sup> This might suggest to some that it would be natural to challenge the Hel-

lenism of Cyrene, but surely we must avoid attributing Periclean ideas of citizenship to all Greeks of all times and must remember that in Hellenistic and Roman times the Greek blood of many "Hellenic" communities, if present at all, must have been very diluted. Moreover, some of the Augustan edicts speak of Romans and Hellenes,<sup>9</sup> and here undoubtedly the citizens of Cyrene of mixed Greek and Libyan descent are included among the Hellenes. Are we to think that at the time of Hadrian the meaning of the word was being so narrowed that the Cyrenaeans were regarded as non-Hellenic? The only possible justification for challenging their Hellenism would seem to be that the city had been transformed into a Roman colony. However, it will be shown below that at the time in question Cyrene cannot have been a Roman colony. Moreover, the example of Corinth<sup>10</sup> suffices to show that such a status did not necessarily disqualify a city from membership. Apparently, as far as membership in the Panhellenion was concerned, Hellenic and Roman were not mutually exclusive terms.

In the third place, Apollonia, the port of Cyrene, was a member of the Panhellenion, directly or indirectly.<sup>11</sup> If this community, which we hardly know whether we are to classify as a separate city or not,<sup>12</sup> was a member, Cyrene herself cannot have been excluded.

In fact, it is possible that Apollonia belonged to the Panhellenion only as a part of Cyrene. It is likely that the cities of the region known to us by name had some sort of corporate existence, but not even the name Pentapolis can be taken as a clear proof of the existence of five independent *poleis*. The name might well be applied to a political entity containing five urban settlements or towns, whether a sympolity

or a single *polis* such as Athens. Actually there is persistent and repeated evidence which points to something like the synoecism of Cyrenaica as the *polis* of Cyrene. Years ago I argued that this is implied in the Ptolemaic *diagramma* of the late fourth century B.C.<sup>13</sup> Even if this particular organization may not have endured long, there are several indications of unity at a later date. As such there is the *koinon* attested by coins for near the middle of the third century.<sup>14</sup> There are also the legends concerning wars between Cyrene and Carthage followed by the establishment of a boundary (Sallust *Iug.* 79; Mela 1. 38) and the passage of Strabo (discussed in n. 12) which may mean that the other cities of Cyrenaica were subject to Cyrene. However, most important of all for our period, is the normal name applied to the province under the Principate. Modern works continue to speak of "Crete and Cyrenaica," though the examples cited in them show that the name rather was "Crete and Cyrene."<sup>15</sup> The expression ἀνθύπατος Κρήτης καὶ Κυρήνης μητροπόλεως (SEG, IX, 170) in an inscription of A.D. 161 is particularly significant as implying that the province of the proconsul consisted of Crete and the city of Cyrene. The one discordant note is the reference to "embassies from the cities of the province" in the first Augustan edict,<sup>16</sup> references in the fourth edict to litigants and judges from different cities, and possibly other expressions in the inscription which may suggest that there were other *poleis* besides Cyrene in the province. However, even this may not mean that all *poleis* had the same standing, and the fact remains that in the name of the province the entire district of Cyrenaica was called Cyrene.

In the discussion which follows,

ancient practice will be followed in applying the term "province" both to the combined province of Crete and Cyrene and to either of the two component parts.

It is now time to turn to the newly published inscription. Let us do so bearing in mind that, if it contains a report of action on the application of Cyrene for admission to the Panhellenion, the action was almost certainly favorable. A general impression of the state of the inscription can most easily be gained by glancing at Fraser's text (p. 78) and comparing it with the plate (Plate V). The letter of Hadrian of A.D. 135 begins in line 2.<sup>17</sup> After the emperor's name and the salutation the text proper (ll. 6-8) reads as follows:

6 ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ Πανελληνίου ἐφέλκει ἐπιστεῖ-  
λαί μοι[  
τὰ δόξαντά μοι ἀντέγ[ρ]αψα καὶ ὑμεῖν ἐπεμψα  
τὴν προ[  
Κἄρος ὁ κράτιστος ἀνθύπατος.<sup>vv7</sup> εὐτυχεῖτε.

Fraser (p. 80) estimates the length of the lines beginning with line 6 as about 70 letters. Thus the missing letters at the end of each of these three lines will be about 30. Since the text proper of the letter is only about two and a half lines long, the document is a brief note rather than a normal letter and, in all likelihood, merely serves as an introduction to what follows. Clearly a question concerning the Panhellenion has received the attention of the emperor and, since it is mentioned in a letter to the Cyrenaeans, it must concern Cyrene. Trouble in interpretation is caused by ἐφέλκει. The use of this verb with an infinitive does not seem to have been noticed before and so its meaning is hard to determine. Fraser suggests "delays" or "is hesitant," while Oliver translates: "The archon of the Panhellenion is making them

consult me by letter concerning [your eligibility]. I have replied by a statement of my opinion . . ." Judging by other uses of the verb as illustrated by the examples in the *Lexicon*, either meaning is possible, but the present tense of the verb makes Oliver's translation awkward. The emperor uses the aorist to describe his own action, and it would make little sense to say: "The archon *is* urging them to consult me, and I replied." On the other hand, it makes perfectly good sense to say that the archon is delaying to consult the emperor — i. e., he has not consulted him — but, nevertheless, the emperor has sent a written statement of his opinion. This also suggests an easy interpretation of the mention of the proconsul. The latter must have supplied the information on which the emperor based his decision.

Hence, in all likelihood, the emperor stated that the archon of the Panhellenion was delaying to consult him on the subject whether or not the Cyrenaeans should be admitted. Nevertheless, he had written his opinion to the archon — and of this statement he is sending a copy to the Cyrenaeans, his decision being based on information supplied by the proconsul. I think there is room for this on the stone but, on account of the uncertainty, think it best not to attempt to restore the wording of the text. The use of ἀντέγραψα in a communication to an official from whom the emperor has received no inquiry on the subject may seem strange but may mean that the inquiry is considered delayed for some reason.

The first words preserved of the next document are found in line 9, but the wording is such that we must suppose that the document began in the preceding line. This would be natural, since on any interpretation it is closely con-

nected with the emperor's letter. Fraser (p. 85) thinks that the author of the statement is the proconsul, Carus, while Oliver thinks that it is a note added by the *ab epistulis*. In my opinion, as implied above, it is a statement of the emperor's ruling, for which there is no room in his short letter. It too is brief and compressed and ends with line 12.

This document is even more difficult to interpret than the emperor's letter. It reads as follows:

δέχεσθαι δεῖ· οὐ μέντοι δίκαια ἀξιούσιν, τῶν  
αὐτ[  
10 νος Ἀχαιῶν καὶ ἀκραιβῶς Δωρῶν· αὐτοὶ δὲ  
ἰθαγενεῖς  
προσεκτήσαντο τὴν προσσηγορίαν ἀπὸ τοῦ  
ἐπικρυ[  
λιν Κυρηναίων δὲ δύο συνέδρους πεμπόντων]

The one point which seems relatively certain is that the ruling of the emperor was in favor of the Cyrenaeans. If we allow in line 8 for a few vacant spaces before the beginning of the document, the number of missing letters is about 20. The first clause may have been something like this: τοὺς μὲν Κυρηναίους εἰς]δέχεσθαι δεῖ. Then there follows a reference to an unjust claim, a reference to the heroes, Achaeus and Dorus, a reference to some persons of "direct descent," a reference to the acquisition of a name, a reference to the Cyrenaeans, and a reference to two *synedroi*. Before trying to disentangle this, allow me to give my impression of the meaning of ἀκραιβῶς, which Fraser finds "particularly obscure" and which Oliver translates "and even." My own feeling is that it has the force of "specifically" or "more exactly," and thus fits a legend according to which the Dorians were a subdivision or branch of the Achaeans and Dorus probably a son of Achaeus. As far as I know, no such myth or legend has been preserved, but the invention of one in connection with the foundation story

of some city would not be impossible. It does not matter a great deal, however, for the interpretation of this detail helps little with the understanding of the reference to Achaeus and Dorus. Nevertheless, it may be noted that an interesting proof of the continued pride of the Cyrenaeans in their Doric descent is the claim of Synesius of Cyrene, the Neoplatonist bishop of the early fifth century, that he was descended from Eurysthenes, "who led the Dorians to Sparta," and that the record of this descent down to his father was carved on public tablets.<sup>18</sup> This statement suggests that mythmakers were busy at Cyrene as well as at cities with less claim to be Hellenic.

If the conjecture that the first clause in the document rules that the Cyrenaeans are to be admitted into the Panhellenion is correct, this goes far to explain what follows. The ones who have made an unjust claim — or, as the context will now suggest, an unjust accusation — are the Cyrenaeans. The nature of the accusation is to be determined in part from the fact that their statement obviously continues with the claim that they themselves are of direct descent, the αὐτοὶ δὲ ἰθαγενεῖς indicating a marked contrast between the accusation against others and their own claim to purity of descent. Who are these others? It might be natural to think of some other city of Cyrenaica and particularly of one which might have been given a non-Hellenic addition to the population through the colonizing activities of Trajan and/or Hadrian. The latter is reported by Orosius (7. 12. 6) to have sent colonists to Libya, and on the Peutinger table both Cyrene and Taucheira are marked as colonies. Then there is also Hadrianopolis or Hadriane, which appears to be a new foundation.<sup>19</sup> The planting of colonists

at Cyrene, not by Hadrian but by Trajan, has been confirmed by a recently published inscription from Attaleia.<sup>20</sup> In this L. Gavius Fronto is reported to have been put in charge by Trajan of 3,000 legionary veterans to be settled in Cyrene. It has been plausibly conjectured<sup>21</sup> that this action belongs after the suppression of the Jewish revolt, which thus appears to have been put down before the accession of Hadrian (so Fraser). In all likelihood, the actual planting of the settlers can hardly have been completed before the reign of Hadrian, who, as other evidence shows, displayed an interest in Cyrene,<sup>22</sup> and so we find Hadrian honored as *ktistes* by the *polis* of the Cyrenaeans and as *oikistes* by the Apolloniates.<sup>23</sup> And yet there appears no evidence in the inscriptions that either Cyrene or Taucheira became Roman colonies at the time, and Cyrene, in spite of a few Latin and bilingual inscriptions, obviously remained Greek. It has been recognized that Augustus planted Roman citizens in certain cities without thereby transforming them into colonies.<sup>24</sup> This principle must have been applied also to Cyrene by Hadrian. If the designation of the two cities as colonies on the Peutinger table is based on more than this planting of new settlers, it may be due to a later grant of the title. In any case, Cyrene herself received colonists and so was not in a position to challenge the Hellenism of any other city on the grounds that it had done so. Of course, if the entire Cyrenaica had been synoecized as the city of Cyrene, we cannot well imagine that she appealed to outside authorities against one of her parts. As for Hadrianopolis or Hadriane, a place known only from late itineraries and geographical works,<sup>25</sup> all forms of the name seem to suggest a Greek city.

It is more likely that the objection was directed against some community or communities outside Cyrenaica, probably the "Hellenes" of Marmarica or some city or cities within this district. The geographer Ptolemy classed Marmarica as a nome of Egypt, and documents have proved that this was correct.<sup>26</sup> The transfer to Egypt must have taken place before the time of our inscription.<sup>27</sup> Now it will be remembered that before the transfer Marmarica belonged with Cyrene and that according to the Ptolemaic *diagramma* sons of Cyrenaeans fathers and Libyan mothers from this district as well as from any other part of Cyrenaica were eligible to citizenship. As suggested above, the "Hellenes" of the province in the time of Augustus must have included descendants from these mixed marriages. On the other hand, it will be remembered that not one of the cities of the Pentapolis was located in Marmarica. Hence, the "Hellenes" of the district may have been very few and those few may have been very largely of Libyan descent, so that those of Cyrene might very well consider themselves of purer Hellenic blood. It seems impossible in the present state of our knowledge to know what name was applied to these neighbors whose Hellenism was challenged. It can hardly have been the name of a native tribe but rather one connected with some Greek settlement. For convenience, let us call them "Marmaric Hellenes."

To return to Hadrian's statement, in all likelihood the emperor ruled that the Cyrenaeans should be admitted to the Panhellenion. Nevertheless, they were wrong in stating that the Marmaric Hellenes had no right to claim Achaeus and Dorus as their ancestors in contrast to the "straight descent" of themselves [i.e., the Cyrenaeans].



This interpretation of the reference to pure birth is supported by the reference in line 16 to their ancient purity of descent. It must thus be the Marmaric Hellenes who are accused of having acquired the appellation [of Hellene] in some irregular manner. The ruling concerning the *synedroi* was then probably to the effect that, while the Cyrenaeans send [i.e., are to send] two *synedroi*, the Marmaric Hellenes are to send one. The guess concerning the latter number is based on nothing more secure than the conjecture that the Marmaric community must have been less important than Cyrene. That the Cyrenaeans are to send two seems certain. Since δῆ is postpositive, the πόλιν Κυρηναίων of Fraser, who takes πεμπόντων as an imperative, is impossible; Κυρηναίων must be construed with what follows and Κυρηναίων... πεμπόντων must be a genitive absolute, as Oliver too seems to think.<sup>28</sup>

Against this interpretation it may possibly be alleged that it would be strange to have any community in the district of Marmarica represented in the Panhellenion. Such a presupposition, however, should not be allowed to frighten us away from the most natural interpretation of the document. There is other evidence which suggests that the Panhellenion was liberal in its admission of members, and so this new evidence would merely lend more color to the picture and indicate that the liberality was even greater than we had formerly thought. It is also to be noted that, while the other records we have of action on the question of the admission of members do not suggest appeal to the emperor, in the one case of a recorded intervention by Hadrian, he intervened on the side of liberality. The significance of this for the broader interpretation of the policy of Hadrian cannot be taken up here.

Much of what has been said so far is obviously conjectural, but the state of the evidence is such that bold reconstruction seems warranted provided the results are not misrepresented. There is, however, one conclusion which seems certain, namely that Cyrene was represented in the Panhellenion. It is also likely that Cyrene is the city or province referred to as having two representatives. It remains to discuss the significance of these two representatives for the institutions of the Panhellenion. From this point of view it matters little whether they represented Cyrene or some other community.

The chief conclusion to be drawn from the reference to the two *synedroi* is simple. The old theory of Guiraud that each city had one representative<sup>29</sup> must be abandoned. The mere fact that we have evidence for two representatives for one community is enough to demolish the theory. Guiraud, however, does not give it as a theory but as a fact supported by evidence, though a quick glance is enough to show that he has misinterpreted the evidence. He cites three inscriptions which prove to be concerned with honors bestowed upon a representative of Aezani,<sup>30</sup> but the fact that one representative was honored does not prove that the city had no more than one. Next he cites three examples of dedications at Athens by other cities, but in only one of the three is it recorded that the agent is a representative in the Panhellenion.<sup>31</sup> Naturally, even this does not prove that the city in question possessed merely a single representative, and, even if it did, it would supply proof only for one city and not for the other members of the Panhellenion. To be sure, after Guiraud wrote, considerable new evidence has come to light, and this is now conveniently listed by Tod and Oliver.



Much of it is of the kind already considered: references in honorific decrees or in records of their *cursus* to services of individuals in the Panhellenion. Thus there is nothing to strengthen the case for the theory of a single representative per community. On the contrary, some of the new evidence rather points in the opposite direction. In fact, a recently published inscription has been interpreted to mean that Sardes had more than one *synedros* acting on her behalf on one occasion.<sup>32</sup> This interpretation seems correct. There is also a fragmentary Spartan inscription which has Πανέλληνες followed by two or more names.<sup>33</sup> It is natural to suppose that the men so listed were representatives at the same time. In a still more fragmentary inscription from Pagae, two Panhellenes are listed.<sup>34</sup> In all likelihood these represented Megara. The three inscriptions suggest that Sardes, Sparta, and Megara each had more than one representative but do not supply completely convincing proof. It is barely possible that the lists contain representatives for more than one year. Hence, the special importance of our Cyrenaic inscription, which refers to two *synedroi* in such a way as to indicate that this must be the number of delegates to which the state in question is entitled.

Can we go farther in determining the nature of the representation? Oliver thinks we can. He writes: "Probably every affiliated city had two *synedroi* ..., as each *ethnos* in the Pylaeo-Delphic Amphictyony had two *hieromnemones*." This theory is fully as mistaken as Guiraud's theory of one representative for each city.

Our document, as noted, dates from A.D. 135. The Panhellenion appears to have been founded in 131/2.<sup>35</sup> A few years earlier, in 125, Hadrian had writ-

ten to Delphi concerning some reform in representation in the Amphictionic League. The one detail which is clear from one of the preserved fragments is that the representation of Thessaly was to be reduced and the votes taken away from her to be distributed to Athens, Sparta, and other cities.<sup>36</sup> The exact place of this measure in the history of the Amphictionic League does not concern us. The only point of importance is that Hadrian's reform clearly marks an effort to adjust representation more adequately. Nor is there any ambiguity on this point. It is impossible to argue that, while the numbers of *synedroi* varied, the units represented may have had equality of vote, for the document does not speak of *synedroi* but of *psephoi*, i. e., votes. Under the circumstances, when Hadrian had struggled with adjusting the representation in this older organization, we cannot imagine that he adopted a more reactionary system for the Panhellenion. He must have tried to adjust the representation also in it to the citizen population or importance of the communities represented.

There is one little point which seems to call for a remark. It was suggested above that the Cyrene represented in the Panhellenion was the entire province of Cyrene or Cyrenaica. The representation of such a large unit as a whole, apparently, would not be unusual. At least in some cases it appears that federal states as such were represented rather than their constituent cities. The evidence is clearest for Crete.<sup>37</sup> It is likely that also the Thessalian League was represented as such, though direct evidence is lacking.<sup>38</sup> On the other hand, records suggest that Asiatic cities rather than the *Commune Asiae* were represented, but this was a *koinon* of a different type. Whatever was the case

with these other organizations, the example of Crete is important. If one of the two component parts of the province of Crete and Cyrene was represented as a unit, it would not be unnatural that also the other should be so represented.

Is it possible to go still further in determining the system of representation in the Panhellenion? It seems safe to conclude that, if the province of Cyrene had only two representatives, then the delegations as a whole must have been small, and it is natural to think of the system of one, two, and three votes per city known best from the statement about Lycia quoted by Strabo from Artemidorus (*ca.* 100 B.C.). The latter statement probably gives the proportion according to which cities were represented, and it has been conjectured that the cities had one, two, or three representatives each in the federal *boule*, the smaller of the two federal assemblies, and a larger number in the federal *ekklesia*, which in Lycia also was a representative assembly.<sup>39</sup> As already implied, the small delegation from Cyrene suggests that the *syndrion* of the Panhellenion corresponds rather to the smaller than the larger of the two Lycian federal assemblies. There is also other evidence which suggests that under the Empire it was common to classify cities in three classes. Thus there is the classification of the cities of Asia in three classes in a letter of Antoninus Pius to the *Commune Asiae*.<sup>40</sup>

This, coupled with the example of Lycia, has led to the conjecture that also in the assembly of this organization the cities each had one, two, or three representatives depending on size.<sup>41</sup> On the other hand, there is the example of the Amphictionic League, for which we hear of six votes each for Nicopolis, Macedon, and Thessaly in the League as reorganized by Augustus. To be sure, this statement, often repeated and generally accepted, depends on an emendation in the text of Pausanias but, nevertheless, is almost certainly correct.<sup>42</sup> Hadrian, it may be noted, reduced the representation of at least one of the states with six votes. In any case, as large delegations as this in the Panhellenion seem unlikely, particularly since many of the representatives came from a considerable distance. Hence, until further evidence becomes available, as good a guess as any is that the members had one, two, or three votes each.

As already noted, much of what has been argued above is frankly conjectural. It can, however, be regarded as certain that Cyrene was a member of the Panhellenion, and that the cities and leagues belonging to it had varying numbers of representatives and votes. As a sort of by-product, it may also be noted that the example of Crete shows that the members need not always be *poleis* but could also be *ethne* or *koina*.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

#### NOTES

1. P. M. Fraser, "Hadrian and Cyrene," *JRS*, XL (1950), 77-87; J. H. Oliver in "New Evidence on the Attic Panhellenion," *Hesperia*, XX (1951), 31-33.

2. For the Panhellenion in general Oliver lists M. N. Tod, "Greek Inscriptions from Macedonia," *JHS*, XVIII (1922), 167-80 and Paul Graindor, *Athènes sous Hadrien* (Cairo, 1934). To this can be added Wilhelm Weber, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Hadrianus* (Leip-

zig, 1907), especially pp. 271ff. The articles Πανελλήνιος (Ziebarth) and "Panhellenia" (L. Ziehen) in *RE*, XVIII have little to offer. Works listed in this note and in n. 1, as well as David Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (Princeton, 1950) and A. H. M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (Oxford, 1937), will be listed merely by the names of the authors.

3. On the question of votes in proportion to popula-

tion see Larsen, "Representation and Democracy in Hellenistic Federalism," *CP*, XL (1945), 65-97 especially 87f.

4. The admission of Cibra seems to be referred to in a mutilated dedication by the city found at Puteoli (*IG*, XIV, 829 = *IGR*, I, 418 = *OGI*, 497). For the mixed population of Cibra, see Strabo 13. 631; for her later claim to be a Lacedaemonian colony, *IGR*, III, 500. i.

5. *IG*, II<sup>a</sup>, 1091 = *OGI*, 503.

6. For evidence on Magnesia and citations of the earlier literature see Magie, pp. 894f. Herodotus does not include Magnesia among the twelve Ionian cities (1. 142) and in another passage (3. 90. 1) lists the Magnes as a separate ethnic group alongside of Ionians, Aeolians, Carians, Lycians, etc. Does not this suggest that they were a non-Greek people? To be sure, reference to them by Callinus (in commentary on Frag. 3 Diehl<sup>1</sup>) and Archilochus (Frag. 19 Diehl<sup>2</sup>) as cited by Strabo (14. 647f.) indicate that Greeks were early aware of them, and that they may have begun to become Hellenized early. The elaborate foundation legends suggest a city which had to go to great lengths to prove its Hellenism. Otto Kern (*Die Gründungsgeschichte von Magnesia am Maiandros* [1894], p. 25) conjectures that Hellanicus had a hand in their formation. Sayce, in his commentary, applies Herod. 3. 90. 1 only to Magnesia by Sipylus, but there seems to be no reason why it should not apply to Magnesia on the Maeander or to both cities or groups. Willamowitz (*Hermes*, XXX [1895], 177 ff.) takes the Magnes to be a Hellenic tribe.

7. For Aczani under Hadrian, *IGR*, IV, 562 = *CIG*, 3841; for the non-Hellenic origin, Magie, p. 132. For Sardes, *Hesperia*, X (1941), 82, No. 35.

8. *SEG*, IX, 1; for a summary of the history of Cyrene with emphasis on the citizenship see Jones, pp. 351ff.

9. *SEG*, IX, 8.

10. The membership of Corinth is attested by *IG*, IV, 1600 = *Corinth*, VIII, 1, No. 80; No. 81, also cited by Oliver, is too mutilated to have independent value.

11. *IG*, II<sup>a</sup>, 3407 is the inscription on the base of a statue of Marcus Aurelius dedicated at Eleusis by Ἀπολλωνιάται of κατὰ Κυρήνην acting through a Panhellene, i.e., a representative in the *synedria* of the Panhellenion. The document, of course, does not state that the Panhellene was the representative of Apollonia, but this is a natural interpretation. Another possibility is that Apollonia was a part of the *polis* of Cyrene and that the Panhellene in question was a representative of the latter city. In fact, in Daremberg-Saglio, III, 849 Fougeres cites this inscription (*CIG*, 351) as evidence for the membership of Cyrene.

12. There seems to be little to be found anywhere about Apollonia. The only mention in *SEG*, IX appears to be in No. 252, a milestone. In the earlier literature the city is the port of Cyrene and is nameless. According to Jones (p. 485, n. 11) the first occurrence of the name is in Strabo 17. 837. This undoubtedly is correct, but I do not understand how he can say that Strabo "is also the first to say that it was a separate city" (p. 359). Strabo speaks of it as the *ἐκτενέων* of the Cyrenaeans, thus using a word applied by Herodotus (6. 116) to Phalerum in relation to Athens and by Thucydides (1. 30. 2; 2. 84. 5) to Cyllene in relation to Ellis; cf. the similar usage of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 9. 56. 5). Strabo also speaks of Apollonia and the other cities of Cyrenaica as *περιτόλεια* of Cyrene, a word which probably implies subjection.

13. "Notes on the Constitutional Inscription from Cyrene," *CP*, XXIV (1929), 351-68 at 354f.; the inscription is now *SEG*, IX, 1.

14. The date is fixed by the fact that some of the coins are overstruck on coins of Magas (E. S. G. Robinson, *BMC Cyrenaica*, pp. cxxxv f.; Jones, p. 359).

15. The normal form of the name was *Creta et Cyrenae* (examples: Suet. *Vesp.* 2. 3; Dessau, 961, 1024, 1048, 1084) or *Creta Cyrenae* (Dessau, 1072, 1096), in both forms abbreviations being used at times (Dessau, 1153, 8981). Note that the name of the city in Latin usually is plural (Dessau, III, p. 615, s.v.). In Greek the corresponding two forms (with or without "and") are used, the chief difference being that the Greek name for Cyrene is singular (Dessau, 8819, 8819a; *IGR*, I, 968-70; IV, 275, 375, 383-85, 390; *SEG*, IX, 170). The lists given are far from exhaustive, but no evidence which suggests that "Cyrenaica" was used as a part of the name of the province has been knowingly suppressed. At first glance the expression Κυρηναϊκή ἐπαρχία used in the Augustan edicts (*SEG*, IX, 8, ll. 14, 56, and 64) seems to be such evidence, but the expression τὴν Κυρηναίαν καὶ Κυρηναίων ἐπαρχίαν, "the Cretan and Cyrenale province" or "province of Crete and Cyrene," shows that Κυρηναϊκή here is merely the adjective derived from Κυρήνη and that the "Cyrenale province" is not the "province of Cyrenaica" but "the province of Cyrene." The entry, "Cyrenaica provincia," in the index for *L'Année épigraphique*, 1927, No. 166 refers to Oliverio's Latin translation of *SEG*, IX, 8. Moreover, "Cyrenaica" and Κυρηναία, which does occur several times in the literary sources (cf. Pape-Benseler, s.v.) may mean "the territory of Cyrene" fully as well as "the territory containing Cyrene and other cities."

16. *SEG*, IX, 8. In spite of the Greek of the inscription, its language seems important for the meaning and use of *provincia*. Apparently this term and the corresponding Greek word could be used equally well for Cyrene (or "Cyrenaica") alone and for Crete and Cyrene combined. It might also be argued that the expressions, ἡ περὶ Κυρήνην ἐπαρχία (ll. 4f.) and ἡ κατὰ Κυρήνην ἐπαρχία (ll. 14f. and 37), suggest that the province included more than the city of Cyrene.

17. The year is more exactly 134/5, but since the nineteenth year of the *tribunicia potestas* of Hadrian began December 10, 134 (Cagnat, *Cours d'épigraphie latine*, p. 196) the date is almost certainly 135.

18. Synesius *Ep.* 57, p. 667 Hereher. Undoubtedly this genealogy was on a par with those created at Cibra when the latter city claimed to have been founded by the Lacedaemonians (*IGR*, III, 500; cf. Magie, p. 141), though Cyrene actually was much more Hellenic than Cibra.

19. For evidence see Jones, p. 486, n. 15; cf., also K. Miller, *Itineraria Romana*, cols. 875 and 877.

20. Reprinted in *JRS*, XL (1950), 84, n. 37 from *Türk tarih kurumu, Belleten*, XI (1947), 101-4, No. 19; cf. also J. and L. Robert, *REG*, LXI (1948), 201.

21. By G. Pflaum quoted by Robert.

22. Cf. the inscriptions assembled by S. Applebaum at the end of Fraser's article, *JRS*, XL (1950), 87-90.

23. Cyrene: *SEG*, IX, 54 and 136; Apollonia: *IG*, II<sup>a</sup> 3306.

24. T. R. S. Broughton, "Some Non-Colonial Coins of Augustus," *TAPA*, LXVI (1935), 18-24; cf. J. and L. Robert, *loc. cit.*, p. 200 and the literature cited there; also Magie, p. 1332 in n. 7.

25. Miller, *Itineraria*, col. 877; Jones, p. 486, n. 15. The earliest entry is probably in the *Itin. Ant.* 67, which is dated under Diocletian by Miller (p. liv). Jones gives the impression that the form Hadrianopolis occurs only on the Peutinger table. However, it is found also in Guido *Geographica* 91, p. 522. 12 Pinder and Parthey, while Adrianopolis is found in *Ravennatis anonymi cosmographia* 5, p. 353. 14 Pinder and Parthey.

26. Ptol. 4. 5. 1; documents antedating Diocletian: *IGR*, IV, 1624 (listed by Jones; cf. *PIR*, I<sup>a</sup>, 296, No. 1458); *P. Rainer*, 259 of A.D. 237 analyzed by C. Wessely, *REG*, XXXII (1919), 504-7, which, however, is not convincing by itself for the inclusion of Marmarica in Egypt; the land register of Marmarica of A.D. 190/1 given in *P. Vat.*, 11 published by M. Norsa and G. Vitelli in *Studi e testi*, No. 53 (Città del Vaticano, 1931), discussed and in part translated by A. C. Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, pp. 58ff., No. 18; *SEG*, IX, 9, which shows that in the reign of Claudius Gothicus the prefect of Egypt, Probus, had put an end to a long Marmaric war. The Probus in question was not the later emperor but Tenagino Probus; for his career see A. Stein, "Tenagino Probus," *Klio*, XXIX (1936), 237-42; A. Alföldi, *CAH*, XII, 180; Mattingly, *ibid.*, p. 314, n. 1. This document combined with the many references to Marmaric wars (cf. *SEG*, IX, 63) suggests a likely reason for the transfer. Egypt was probably the best base of operations for such wars so long as there was no adequate force in Cyrene itself.

27. Jones (p. 362) thinks the time was in the first or early second century; Romanelli (*CAH*, XI, 673, n. 2) thinks the transfer may have been the result of the Jewish rising.

28. Fraser suggests as an alternative "to suppose an abbreviation of δῆ(μον)," but, "though perhaps supported by what looks like a contraction-mark on the stone," he does not favor this. It seems so impossible that it can be safely ruled out. Cannot the mark in question be a fault in the stone?

29. Paul Guiraud, *Les Assemblées provinciales dans l'Empire romain* (Paris, 1887), p. 64 and n. 6. This is connected with his broader theory that in provincial assemblies the cities usually had one vote each (p. 65), and this though he has just cited the evidence to the contrary from Gaul, Thessaly, Asia, and Lycia. On this broader issue E. G. Hardy, *Studies in Roman History* (first series, 1910), p. 252 holds that the evidence is inconclusive; Last, *CAH*, XI, 473 is inclined to believe in representation in proportion to size and importance.

30. Lebas-Waddington, *Inscript. d'Asie Mineure*, 867, 868, and 869 (= *OGI*, 507, 505, and 504 = *IGR*, IV, 576, 574, and 573).

31. *CIA*, III, 471 (= *IG*, II<sup>a</sup>, 3289) contains a dedication to Hadrian by Dium through a *legatus*; *CIA*, III, 472 (= *IG*, II<sup>a</sup>, 3290), a similar dedication through a *presbyter*; only *CIA*, III, 534 (= *IG*, II<sup>a</sup>, 3407) records a dedication through a Panhellenic. This is the dedication of Apollonia-by-Cyrene which already has been mentioned.

32. *Hesperia*, X. (1941), 82, No. 35. The preserved part consists of two fragments not contiguous. On one is the name of Sardes; on the other, σῶνδεσσι followed by a list of names, number unknown. The Panhellenion is not mentioned, but to what other *synedria* at Athens would Sardes send representatives?

33. *IG*, V, 1, 164.

34. *IG*, VII, 192.

35. Weber, pp. 208 and 268; Graindor, pp. 39f.

36. A. Bourguet, *De rebus Delphicis imperatoriae aetatis* (Montepessulano, 1905), p. 79; Weber, p. 195; cf. also J. S. Reid, *The Municipalities of the Roman Empire* (Cambridge, 1913), p. 417; Larsen in T. Frank, *Econ. Surv. Rome*, IV, 452; *CP*, XL (1945), 87, n. 110.

37. *Inscriptiones Creticae*, I, p. 205, No. 56 as emended by Klaffenbach, *Klio*, XXX (1937), 255 refers to a citizen of Lyttus who has been elected by the Cretan League as its representative.

38. Titus Flavius Cyllus, who appears as the archon of the Panhellenion in a letter to Aezani (*OGI*, 504), is identified by Oliver (*AJP*, LXIX [1948], 440f.) with a Cyllus of Hypata, at that time belonging to the Thessalian

League. Since he appears to have served as archon in A.D. 156 (cf. *OGI*, 504, n. 4), it is unlikely that he can be the same man as the Cyllus of *SIG*<sup>3</sup>, 822, who is thought to have been active in A.D. 95, but his connection with the family of Hypata prominent in Thessalian affairs is almost certain. In connection with the archonate, there is no indication of his origin, but, in view of the importance of the Thessalian League as a political unit, it is more likely that the League as a whole, rather than its constituent cities, was represented in the Panhellenion. The importance of Thessaly is indicated among other things by its prominence in the Amphictyonic League (cf. n. 42).

39. Strabo 14. 664f.; cf. Larsen, *CP*, XL (1945), 83f.

40. *Dig.* 27. 1. 6. 2.

41. Most recently Magie, p. 448.

42. See Paus. 10. 8. 3-5. In this passage Pausanias reports that Augustus desired Nicopolis to be represented in the Amphictyonic *synedria* and so arranged that the Magnes, Malians, Aenians, and Phthiotians should share representation with the Thessalians, and that the votes of these and of the Dolopians, who no longer existed as a *genos*, should be cast by Nicopolis. He continues: "The Amphictyons of my time were thirty in number. From Nicopolis and Macedonia and the Thessalians, from each in number there were . . . ; from (ἐκ) the Boeotians . . ." The number for the representatives of each of the three first units has dropped out. The others enumerated, beginning with the Boeotians, number twelve. Hence, the joint delegations of Nicopolis, Macedonia, and Thessaly must have numbered eighteen, and our missing number must have been six. Apparently ἐξ dropped out before ἐκ. This is so obvious that the emendation once made seems not to have been challenged.

As long as we had only the evidence of Pausanias, it was natural to take for granted that the distribution of votes given by Pausanias as that of his own times was the one which resulted from the reorganization of Augustus. This continues to be the view even now when we know that Hadrian readjusted the representation. Cf. E. A. Freeman, *History of Federal Government*<sup>4</sup> (1893), pp. 105f.; H. Bürgel, *Die pylaenisch-delphische Amphiktyonie* (1877), p. 298; Mommsen, *Provinces of the Roman Empire*, I, 254 and n. 1; Bourguet, *op. cit.*, p. 80; Busolt, *Griechische Staatskunde*, p. 1298; Larsen, *Econ. Surv. Rome*, IV, 449. Pausanias cannot be describing the distribution after Hadrian's reforms, for the latter wished to readjust representation in favor of Sparta and Athens, while Pausanias still assigns only one seat to Athens and does not mention Sparta at all. Hence, it is natural to continue to think that his description, probably taken from a predecessor, refers to the distribution of seats resulting from the work of Augustus. It is hard to take seriously the reconstruction in the Columbia dissertation in political science by Eleanor H. Grady, *Epigraphic Sources of the Delphic Amphiktyony* (Walton, N.Y.: The Reporter Co., 1931), p. 30, n. 1.

Such is the evidence on the basis of which it has been concluded that Augustus increased the number of votes in the Amphictyonic council from twenty-four to thirty, that he gave representation to Nicopolis and Macedonia, and that he gave these two and Thessaly each six votes. As in so many cases for which we have only one account, it has been accepted as though it were the inspired word. In the present instance the case is stronger than for many unique accounts. The details are not such as Pausanias or anyone else is likely to have invented, and the account, when emended as indicated above, is coherent and plausible, except that the votes transferred from others to Nicopolis seem to number more than six. It may be noted that one of the letters of Hadrian contains a reference to twelve votes. Bourguet (pp. 79f.) takes this as a reference to the votes of Thessaly and Nicopolis, but this and other problems involved cannot be discussed here.

# THE LION IN THE HOUSE

(*Agamemnon* 717-36 [Murray])

BERNARD M. W. KNOX

THIS parable<sup>1</sup> of the lion in the house, in the third stasimon of the *Agamemnon*, comes unannounced from the mouth of the chorus with all the abruptness and dark ambiguity of an oracular response. The opening phrase abandons the theme of the preceding lines, Helen and Troy (the connecting word οὕτως comes seventh in the sentence); the closing words provide no verbal link<sup>2</sup> with the following strophe, which resumes the abandoned theme. The parable's apparent thematic independence of its context is emphasized by a formal device, the reappearance in its end of its opening words, ἔθρεψεν . . . δόμοις, δόμοις προσεθρέφθη; this is a well-known technique for marking off a self-contained digression, which is already fully developed in Homer — it appears, for instance, in the long digression which explains the origin of Odysseus' scar in *Odyssey* 19.<sup>3</sup> The lioncub parable is a separate unity formally marked off from its context, and this, together with its emphatic position, central in the central stasimon of the tragedy, suggests that its meaning is of more than local importance.

It has, of course, its local application. The context suggests that the lioncub is Helen, and the man who takes it into his house Paris,<sup>4</sup> or more generally, Troy. This interpretation, demanded by the context in which the parable appears, is discussed and developed at length by the modern critics.<sup>5</sup>

The parallel is exact and significant. Troy adopts and maintains, ἔθρεψεν, Helen, and at the outset of her life at

Troy, ἐν βίτου προτελείοις, she is gentle, ἄμερον. The phrase ἐν βίτου προτελείοις has a striking appropriateness, for προτέλεια, "preliminaries," are strictly "ceremonies previous to the consummation of marriage";<sup>6</sup> this is a sarcastic reflection on the γάμος, the "marriage" of Helen and Paris. The connotations of the word προτέλεια also suggest the incongruous idea of virginity, an ironical reference to the promiscuity of Helen, which the chorus has already referred to specifically earlier in the play; πολυάνορος . . . γυναικὸς they call her in the parodos (62).<sup>7</sup> She was delightful to those who are held in honor, to the elders (each of the disputed readings γεραροῖς and γεραιοῖς suggests the other); the phrase refers, as Headlam points out,<sup>8</sup> to the famous passage in *Iliad* 6, where even the old men of Troy are for a moment swayed by Helen's beauty. The epic forms and usages found in these lines, the locative δόμοις, the forms πολέα, ποτί, and (adopting Casaubon's reading) ἔσ' emphasize the reference to the Homeric scene.

The antistrophe describes the destruction brought to Troy by Helen, the lioncub. When the time came, χρονοισθείς, she repaid those who had sheltered her, χάριν . . . τροφεῦσιν ἀμείβων, with blood, αἷματι δ' οἶκος ἐφύρθη. She was μέγα σίνος πολύκτονον for the Trojans, μία τὰς πολλὰς, τὰς πάνυ πολλὰς ψυχὰς ὀλέσας' ὑπὸ Τροίᾳ are the words the chorus uses of her later in the play (1456-57).

This is the immediate dramatic relevance of the parable of the lioncub,



and with this interpretation of it the modern commentators have, so far as I have been able to ascertain, rested content.<sup>9</sup> But even within the limits of the stasimon in which the parable appears another significance, an abstract one, is suggested by parallel and echo. The lioncub is a type of the ὕβρις νεάζουσα of the fourth strophe of the stasimon (763-70). Just as the lioncub, when the time comes, χρονισθεῖς, reveals the temper of its parents, ἀπέδειξεν ἦθος τὸ πρὸς τοκέων, so the new hybris, νεάζουσιν... ὕβριν, appears, when the time comes, ὅτε τὸ κύριον μὸλῃ φάος τόκου, a spirit invincible, ἄμαχον (769), like the lioncub, ἄμαχον ἄλγος, black ruin for the house, μελαίνας μελάροισιν "Ατας, like the lioncub which is a priest of ruin, ἱερεὺς τις ἄτας, and this black ruin, like the lioncub, resembles its parents, εἰδομένης τοκεῦσιν (771). The lioncub image is thus associated with the process of the reappearance of evil from generation to generation which is the central problem of the trilogy; and thus indirectly associated with the house of Atreus and the individual characters in whom the whole process is worked out to an end and the problem to a solution.

That this apparently simple and direct story of the lioncub should contain complicated and indirect significance ought to surprise no one; the characteristic ambiguity of the choral odes of the *Agamemnon* is well-known. It is particularly striking in passages where the dramatically obvious meaning is, as in this case, a justification of the Trojan war and its hero, Agamemnon. The lines in the parodos, for example, which compare Agamemnon and Menelaus, robbed of Helen, to eagles robbed of their young, (49-59), cannot fail to suggest to the audience Clytemnestra robbed of her daughter Iphigenia, for the image is more appropriate to her situ-

ation than it is to theirs. The lines of the second stasimon which in general terms condemn Paris and Troy (369-80) are equally applicable to Agamemnon, so much so that the chorus, as if realizing where its words are leading, pulls up short and emphatically repeats the name of Paris οἶος καὶ Πάρις (399). In both cases a confident statement of support for the war and the war-aims of its leaders has, as it develops, suggested to the audience, if not to the chorus itself, the dark and complicated reality behind the bright façade of the "official" view. The lioncub parable is equally "official" on the surface—Troy which took in Helen has got what it deserved—but below the surface there is conscious foreboding and unconscious prophecy of disaster to come. And this is made clear as the pattern of the whole trilogy unfolds; this parable is the center of one of the main designs, an elaborate pattern of imagery which extends throughout the *Agamemnon* and into the central and final play of the trilogy. It is a complex knot of suggestions which evoke simultaneously all the principal human figures of the *Oresteia*.

Headlam, who saw so much, seems to have glimpsed this too. At any rate, in his pioneering article *Metaphor* (1902),<sup>10</sup> he remarked, with reference to this passage, "There are more parallels than have commonly been observed in *Agamemnon* 718 seq." He did not discuss them in this article, and in his later comment on the passage he seems to have abandoned his earlier view, for he states there, with exclusive emphasis, "the lion-cub is Helen and the herdsman Paris." He adopts Wecklein's conjecture βούτας for the οὐτ<sup>ως</sup> of the MSS, and this conjecture, brilliant though it is, has the effect of limiting the significance of the parable, for it puts an



overwhelming emphasis on the surface meaning — Helen the lioncub and Paris the shepherd, who took her into his house.<sup>11</sup> This is the best reason for suspecting it, for it may safely be said of the text of the choral odes of the *Agamemnon* that any conjecture which lessens or removes dramatic ambiguity is for that reason alone suspect. Headlam's adoption of βούτας is a rare example of the pitfall into which his brilliant critical method led him when carried to extremes; his insistence on the traditional and proverbial element in Greek poetry<sup>12</sup> (an admittedly correct emphasis) led him in this case to create a "commonplace,"<sup>13</sup> to use his characteristic word, where it did not exist, and to impoverish the text.

The received text, οὕτως ἀνὴρ,<sup>14</sup> suggests initially Paris or Troy, just as the lioncub, in the context of the stasimon, suggests Helen. But ἀνὴρ is indefinite in the proper manner of the parable, and may be any man; for example, Menelaus, who took the lioncub into his house when he married Helen. The reference to marriage ceremonies in the words ἐν βιότου προτελείοις is even more appropriate for Menelaus and Helen than for Paris and Helen. The parable as a whole is rich in meaning when so understood; in return for her bed and board, χάριν γὰρ τροφεῦσιν ἀμείβων, she brought her husband's house blood and ruin, αἵματι δ' οἶκος ἐφύρθη, she is μέγας σίνος πολύκτονον for the Greeks no less than for the Trojans, she is indeed a priest of ruin, ἱερεὺς τις ἄτας, for the Pelopidae. This implication of the story of the lioncub reveals the mental disturbance that lies behind the confident tone of the chorus' comparison. Menelaus is to blame for marrying Helen; the chorus hints at the general discontent with the war, its unworthy cause and its disproportionate losses — a sub-

dued echo of the strong disapproval which the chorus expressed openly in the second stasimon.

Of this meaning of the lioncub parable the chorus, as a character in the play, is perhaps half-, perhaps fully conscious. But the parable means much more than this, much more than the old men, in dramatic time and place, can possibly realize. As so often in the *Agamemnon*, they say more than they know, ἔτι γὰρ θέοθεν καταπνεύει πειθῶ, μολπᾶν ἀλκάν, ξύμφυτος αἰὼν, the force of their singing comes from on high. And in this ode perhaps more than any other in the play, they are the unwitting medium of a superior knowledge.

The full import of the parable is made clear enough to the audience as the play progresses. Lions have already been mentioned in a significant context, the sacrifice of Iphigenia (μαλερῶν λεόντων, 141), and in the scene which immediately follows the stasimon containing the parable Agamemnon boasts of his achievements at Troy in a figure which recalls the conclusion of the story of the lioncub. He speaks of the Greek army at Troy as a raw-fed lion leaping over the wall to lap its fill of the blood of kings (827-28).

ὑπερθορῶν δὲ πύργον ὠμηστής λέων  
ἄδην ἔλειξεν αἵματος τυραννικοῦ.

These two suggestions that the lioncub is connected with Agamemnon, (these references to the lion connect the two contexts most significant for Agamemnon's past, the sacrifice of Iphigenia and the slaughter at Troy) are confirmed by the one human character who sees clearly in the murky atmosphere of the play. Cassandra calls Agamemnon the "noble lion" (λέοντος εὐγενοῦς, 1259), and not content with this she calls Aegisthus (1224) and Clytemnestra (1258) lions too. She explains the full

implications of the parable at a moment in which her prophetic frenzy brings before our eyes the past, present, and future of the house of Atreus, a moment too in which the unconscious prophecies contained in the parable of the lioncub are about to be fulfilled.

"The lion", says Headlam, "which is common on Lydian coins and still extant on the ancient gates of Mycenae, was probably the badge of the Lydian dynasty of Pelops. That seems to be the reason why the term is applied to the various members of the family."<sup>15</sup> Headlam's guess that the lion was the badge of the dynasty of Pelops is supported by a more specific piece of evidence. In Pausanias' description of the chest of Cypselus (5.19), Agamemnon's shield, which appeared on one of the panels, is described in the following words: Φόβος δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος τῇ ἀσπίδι ἔπεστιν ἔχων τὴν κεφαλὴν λέοντος.<sup>16</sup> But this connection of the lion with the house of Pelops can hardly be "the reason why the term is applied to the various members of the family"; Headlam's statement explains how it was possible to call Agamemnon, Clytemnestra and Aegisthus lions, it does not explain what effect is so produced. The fact that the lion was the heraldic device of the house of Pelops may have been the germ of the Aeschylean conception, but the significance of these repeated lion images is surely their reference to the central parable of the lioncub, and the identification of the lioncub of the parable with Agamemnon, Clytemnestra and Aegisthus.

Aegisthus the lion is of course a sarcasm. He is no true lion, as Cassandra's phrase makes clear; λέοντ' ἀναλκιν she calls him, a strengthless lion; he is rather a wolf, as she says later (1259) or a woman, as the chorus calls him in vs. 1625. Yet, like the lioncub, he was

taken into the house, by Clytemnestra, and kept there, ἔθρεψε; that this connotation of the English word "kept" is also possible for τρέφειν is clear from such phrases as τρέφειν γυναῖκα, τρέφειν πορνάς.<sup>17</sup>

Χρονισθεὶς δ' ἀπέδειξεν ἦθος τὸ πρὸς τοκέων, in time he showed himself a true son of Thyestes, and he is ἀμαχον ἄλγος οἰκέταις, invincible bane to the household, in the final scene of the play where, in the moment of victory, he browbeats and threatens the chorus.

This is an ironic suggestion, and one which is not immediately suggested by the words of the chorus; it does not emerge clearly until Cassandra supplies the connection. But the two chief figures of the tragedy are linked to the lioncub in so many ways that the parallel is unmistakable. And in the case of Agamemnon it presents itself immediately. It is suggested in the opening words of the parable by a striking echo.

The opening words ἔθρεψε δὲ λέοντος Ἴνιν recall the only previous mention of lions in the play; the verbal echo is precise. The echo in λέοντος Ἴνιν . . . φιλόμαστον of δρόσοις μαλερῶν λεόντων, πάντων τ' ἀγρονόμων φιλομάστοις θηρῶν ὀβριχάλοισι τερπνά is clear. The opening words of the parable contain a reminiscence of Calchas' prayer to Artemis (141-43), a fruitless attempt to avert the evil that follows, the death of Iphigenia. This echo of the first stasimon brings into the context of the lioncub parable Agamemnon's great crime, which is also Clytemnestra's justification for the murder she is planning.

The same ominous suggestion is made again in the next line ἐν βίτου προτελείοις. This repeats the unusual metaphor of lines 224-27, ἔτλα δ' οὖν θυτὴρ γενέσθαι θυγατρὸς . . . πολέμων ἀρωγὰν

καὶ προτέλεια ναῶν, "he had the daring to become the sacrificer of his daughter, to further his warlike ambitions, a preliminary ceremony for the sailing of his ships." This brings into connection with the lioncub the same crime, but by an even more direct allusion than before; at the same time it recalls an earlier appearance of this same metaphor, vss. 65-66, διακναιομένης τ' ἐν προτελείοις κάμακος, "the spear shattered in the preliminaries of the fighting," which adds to the suggestions with which the parable is loaded the memory of the ten years of battle at Troy. In this one word προτέλεια Aeschylus reminds us of the two counts on which Agamemnon is guilty, the two acts for which he is shortly to die, the murder of Iphigenia and his responsibility for the general slaughter of the war.

This is only the beginning; as the parable unfolds the full wealth of its allusive narrative, the identification of Agamemnon with the lioncub becomes startlingly clear. For the lion is the emblem of the dynasty of Pelops. Hence the young Agamemnon in his father's house is appropriately described as λέοντος ἱνιν, "the lion's whelp," the pride and hope of the royal line. In his childhood he was gentle, a delight to his elders, fondled in their arms. This idyllic description of the childhood of the young prince is disturbed by yet a third intrusion of the same terrible theme which haunts the opening lines, the murder of Iphigenia; the lioncub is called εὐφιλόπαιδα, fond of children. As a description of a lioncub it is an awkward word, a lioncub is not usually fond of children, though children may be fond of a lioncub, and most of the translators render the word by some such phrase as "by the children loved."<sup>18</sup> Yet the force of the verb in compounds of this type is generally active and ap-

plied to Agamemnon the adjective bears its proper meaning and produces a savagely ironical effect. Agamemnon may have loved his child, but he killed her to further his warlike ambitions.

Χρονισθεὶς δ' ἀπέδειξεν ἦθος τὸ πρὸς τοκέων. When the time came, when he grew up, he reverted to the temper of his forebears, Atreus and Pelops. Unbidden he contrived a feast, δαῖτ' ἀκίλευστος ἔτευξεν; Iphigenia's sacrifice again, for these words contain a reminiscence of that same prayer of Calchas which has been recalled before. "May Artemis contrive no windless calm" prays Calchas, "hastening a second sacrifice . . . which shall be no feast," μὴ τινας . . . ἀπλοίας τεύξῃ, σπυδομένα θυσίαν ἐτέραν τιν' . . . ἄδαιτον (150-51). The lioncub brought to the house blood and confusion, αἵματι δ' οἶκος ἐφύρθη, Iphigenia's blood, the blood of all those who fell at Troy, and the blood still to be shed. Like the lioncub, Agamemnon is a great evil that kills many, μέγα σίνος πολυκτόνον; this word πολυκτόνος has been used by the chorus before, in a context which clearly refers to Agamemnon (461); he is blamed for the losses at Troy: τῶν πολυκτόνων γὰρ οὐκ ἄσκοποι θεοί.

The four distinct references to the death of Iphigenia (φιλόμαστον, προτελείοις, εὐφιλόπαιδα, δαῖτ' ἔτευξεν) bring Clytemnestra, as well as Agamemnon to mind, for Iphigenia's death is the most important link between these two. And Clytemnestra, like her husband, is symbolized in the parable of the lioncub; its allusive phrases present her past, her present and her future. Agamemnon took her in, like the man who took in the lioncub; προτελείοις refers to Clytemnestra's marriage as well as Iphigenia's death and Agamemnon's crime. Clytemnestra at first was gentle, ἄμερον; it was Agamemnon's misfortune

that he failed to realize that the lioncub had grown up, failed so badly that he told Clytemnestra to take his concubine into the house and treat her kindly. Εὐφιλόπαιδα is magnificently appropriate, for Clytemnestra's driving passion is her love for her daughter and hatred for that daughter's murderer. When the time came she showed her lion heart — the chorus is unconsciously prophesying things to come — in return for her bed and board, χάριν . . . τροφεῦσιν ἀμείβων, unbidden she contrived a feast, δαῖτ' ἀκίλευστος ἔτευξεν, with slaughter of sheep, μῆλοφόνοισι σὺν ἄταις. What the sheep stand for is made clear many lines later (1057) when Clytemnestra, failing in her attempt to make Cassandra follow Agamemnon into the palace, tells the chorus that she herself must go inside, she has no leisure to remain, the sheep are standing ready for the sacrifice, ἕστηκεν ἤδη μῆλα πρὸς σφαγάς. She is speaking of Agamemnon.

Αἵματι δ' οἶκος ἐφύρθη, the house was a bloody confusion; later Clytemnestra speaks in exultant metaphor of the rain of blood<sup>19</sup> that soaked her as she struck Agamemnon for the first, second and third times. The lioncub is ἱερεύς τις ἄτας, a sort of priest of ruin; Clytemnestra later uses the priestly language of sacrificial technique when she tells how she killed her husband (1384-87), and then claims that the deed was done by "the ancient spirit of revenge," παλαιὸς ἀλάστωρ (1501), who, in her shape, made the final sacrifice, ἐπιθύσας.

Before she goes into the palace to her death Cassandra in her final prophetic frenzy sees that she will herself fall a victim to Clytemnestra, and couches this prophecy in terms of the parable of the lioncub. "This two-footed lioness, who sleeps with the wolf while the noble lion is away, will kill me. . .

αὕτη δίπους λέαινα συγκοιμωμένη  
λύκῳ λέοντος εὐγενοῦς ἀπουσίᾳ  
κτενεῖ με τὴν τάλαιναν. . . .

The two-footed lioness is the lioncub grown up and about to become ἱερεύς τις ἄτας, a priest of ruin.

The parable of the lioncub is a central reference-point for the recurrent lion image of the play. The context in which it appears suggests the official interpretation, a specific identification, Helen the lioncub who brings disaster on those who give her shelter. But the following strophe and antistrophe which echo the words and ideas of the parable, suggest an abstract significance: the lioncub is a symbol of reversal to type, of hybris that resembles its parent; and this connects the parable with the house of Pelops, where in each generation the evil strain in the race comes out. The specific references to the individual members of that house emphasize a new series of identifications, and for each of them the parable has a wealth of meaning. They are initially suggested by the significant echoes with which the words of the parable are packed and finally confirmed by Cassandra who speaks out clearly, no longer from under veils, as she says, καὶ μὴν ὁ χρησμὸς οὐκέτ' ἐκ καλυμμάτων. . . . The lioncub is not only Helen, but Aegisthus, Agamemnon, and Clytemnestra.

It is characteristic of the Oresteia that not even this rich complexity exhausts the significance of the parable. Another identification of the lioncub, which, more sinister and of longer prophetic range than those already discussed, is far beyond the comprehension of the chorus, is suggested by the terms of the parable, developed as the trilogy moves on towards the second act of violence, and confirmed by a specific reference of the chorus of the *Choe-phorae* at the moment when Clytem-

nestra has just been led off to her death at the hands of her son. The lioncub is also Orestes.

This parallel is the most strikingly exact of all five. In the dramatic time of the *Agamemnon* it is Orestes who is the lion's whelp, the young heir of the house that took the lion as its heraldic device. It is to him that the description of the lioncub's childhood is most immediately appropriate, for he is still a child. Τρέφειν, the word which appears in the parable, in one form or another, four times (ἔθρεψε, νεοτρόφου, τροφεῦσιν, προσεθρέφθη), implies childhood, and it is this word which Clytemnestra, speaking of Orestes, uses in the following scene when she explains to Agamemnon that Orestes has been sent abroad (880-81)

τρέφει γὰρ αὐτὸν εὐμενὴς δορύξενος  
Στρόφιός ὁ Φωκεύς. . .

Ἐν βιότῳ προτελείῳ, in the preliminaries of his life he was gentle, a delight to his elders, often held in the arms, like a nursling child; Orestes was fondled in the arms like a nursling child, but he was no ordinary child, he was the lion's whelp.

Many of these particulars of the lioncub's childhood are recalled much later, in the *Choephoroe*, when the nurse Klytessa, grieving over Orestes' reported death, remembers how she took care of him in his infancy. Ὁρέστην . . . ὃν ἐξέθρεψα, "Orestes . . . whom I reared." At the moment when the lioncub, now full grown, is about to kill his mother, the nurse recalls the helplessness of his childhood, the crying in the night, the work he caused her; "for a child that has no intelligence must be looked after like a dumb beast," τὸ μὴ φρονεῖν γὰρ ὥσπερ εἰ βοτὸν τρέφειν ἀνάγκη. This is a reference to the parable, the dumb beast that was looked after like a child.

And in her famous complaint about the indiscipline of the child's belly, νέα δὲ νηδὺς αὐτάρκης τέκνων, "the child's young belly is its own law," she recalls, though in a different sense, the words of the lioncub parable, γαστρός ἀνάγκαις.

Χρονισθεὶς δ' ἀπέδειξεν ἦθος τὸ πρὸς τοκέων. In the fulness of time he showed the temper of his parents, Agamemnon and Clytemnestra. Χρονισθεὶς is one of the most significant words in the passage, "in time" is the characteristic cry of all the characters of the trilogy: "in time" says Calchas, "this expedition captures Priam's city," χρόνῳ μὲν ἀγρεῖ Πριάμου πόλιν ἄδε κέλευθος; "though it took time, it came," says Clytemnestra of her revenge, ἦλθε, σὺν χρόνῳ γε μὴν; "in time has justice come for Priam's sons," ἔμολε μὲν δίκαια Πριαμίδαις χρόνῳ, sings the chorus of the *Choephoroe*, as Clytemnestra is led off to her death.

Χάριν γὰρ τροφεῦσιν ἀμείβων, returning thanks to those that reared him, the opening of the *Choephoroe* shows us Orestes dedicating a lock of hair on Agamemnon's tomb; this is the θρεπτήρια, a symbolic thanks-offering which children made to their parents on coming of age.<sup>20</sup> Orestes gives his mother thanks for his upbringing later in the play.

The physical intimacy of the bond between mother and child is suggested in the parable by the words ἀγάλακτον, "torn from its mother's milk," and φιλόμαστον, "loving the breast." Whatever the precise meaning of ἀγάλακτον, it suggests the mother's milk, γάλα, just as φιλόμαστον suggests her breast, μαστός. And these two words, closely associated, as here, recur in three of the most terrible passages of the *Choephoroe*.

When the chorus describes Clytemnestra's dream, (526-29), they tell



Orestes how, in the dream, she gave suck to a serpent to which she had given birth. "She herself, in her dream, gave it the breast . . . and with the milk it drew a clot of blood."

Χα. αὐτὴ πρόσσεχε μαστὸν ἐν τῶνείρατι.  
Ορ. καὶ πῶς ἄτρωτον οὕθαρ ἦν ὑπὸ στύγους;  
Χο. ὥστ' ἐν γάλακτι θρόμβον αἵματος σπάσαι.

A few lines later, (544-46), Orestes identifies himself with the serpent of the dream and resolves on his mother's death. He repeats the significant words, "the breast that nourished me . . . the kind milk."

οὐφίς . . .  
... μαστὸν ἀμφέχασκ' ἐμὸν θρεπτήριον  
θρόμβω τ' ἐμειξεν αἵματος φίλον γάλα.

Much later, at the climactic moment of the play, when Clytemnestra facing death at her son's hands, points to her breast and reminds him of the bond between them, the same words appear. "This breast . . . from which you drew the nourishing milk" (896-98)

Ἐπίσχες, ὦ παῖ, τόνδε δ' αἶδεσαι τέκνον,  
μαστὸν, πρὸς ᾧ σὺ πολλὰ δὴ βρίζων ἅμα  
οὐλοισιν ἐξήμελξας εὐτραφέας γάλα.

Two of these passages refer directly to the dream of the serpent but all three use the words of the parable of the lioncub. And when Clytemnestra is led off to her death, the chorus, in its song of triumph, emphasizes the connection by referring directly to the lioncub parable of the *Agamemnon*. "It has come to the house of Agamemnon, the double lion . . ." (937-38)

ἔμολε δ' ἐς δόμον τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονος  
διπλοῦς λέων . . .

The words recall not only the δῖπους λέαινα<sup>21</sup> of Cassandra, but the opening

words of the parable itself λέοντος Ἴνιν δέμοις.

In the final play of the trilogy, when the chorus of Furies pursues Orestes to Delphi to exact blood for blood, Apollo expels them from his shrine. "For such beings as you" he says, "this oracle is no fit dwelling-place, you should inhabit the cave of a blood-sucking lion" (193-94)

λέοντος ἄντρον αἱματορρόφου  
οἰκεῖν τοιαύτας εἰκός.

They might have replied that the house of Pelops, which they have inhabited for generations, answers his description precisely. In each generation the children of the house have gone through the cycle of the parable, from auspicious beginning to bloody end; each generation has carried one step farther the sequence of blood for blood, made unbidden a feast, and taken its turn as a priest of ruin.

This speech of Apollo, which occurs in the opening scene of the *Eumenides*, is the last reference to the lion. As the action of the final play develops towards the solution of all the conflicts of the trilogy, human and divine, the familiar cycle is interrupted. The parable is no longer appropriate. Orestes, tried and acquitted by a court of law, a new institution which stands for a new concept of justice, leaves the stage a free man, free of the curse, of that repetitive pattern imposed on the lives of Pelops' descendants by the system of private vengeance, a pattern which is metaphorically represented, both as a general phenomenon and as a complex of individual destinies, in the parable of the lioncub.

YALE UNIVERSITY



## NOTES

1. Headlam refers to it as a "fable," the accepted equivalent of λόγος, the word employed by Aristotle in his discussion of rhetorical "examples," παραδείγματα, *Rhet.* 2. 20. Of invented examples (as distinct from historical ones) Aristotle proposes two classifications, παραβολή and λόγος. The two examples he gives of λόγος both concern animals which think and talk in the Aesopian manner; as examples of παραβολή he instances τὰ Σωκρατικά, the everyday comparisons which are typical of Socratic teaching. The lioncub story falls somewhere in between the two types; it is not an everyday occurrence, but it is not, like the talking hedgehogs and horses of the λόγος, an impossibility. (Martial [2. 75] relates a story similar to that told by Aeschylus, Maximus Tyrius [31. 3 (Hobein, Teubner text)] describes a young Carthaginian who brought up a lion as a pet, Plutarch [*De cohenda ira* 14. 462E] mentions lioncub pets as something common and makes a similar statement in *De fraterno amore* 8. 482C, πολλοὶ δὲ . . . λέοντας τρέφοντες καὶ ἀγαπῶντες; Aelian [*περὶ ζῴων* 5. 39] speaks of the docility of lion cubs, ἡμεγερεῖς γε μὴν . . . πρῶτατος ἐστὶ . . . καὶ φιλοταύτης, and gives a list of famous people who brought them up as pets, Hanno, Berenice, Onomarchus tyrant of Catana, and the sons of Cleomenes.) The connotations of the English word "parable" make it preferable to "fable" in this particular case, for the story, like the parables of the Old and New Testaments, means much more than appears at first sight. It is only when the parable is applied to specific persons that the full meaning emerges. In this respect it is like Christ's parable of the wicked husbandmen (Matt. 21:33-41), which the high priests and elders accept because they do not realize that it applies to them. (For an enlightening discussion of Biblical parables see T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus* [2d. ed.; Cambridge, 1945] pp. 57ff.).

2. The general interpretation of πάροντα (738) as "so" is now generally discredited. (See Liddell and Scott *ad verb.*) Hesychius glosses πάροντα with παρασχημα εὐθέως παραντίκα.

3. *Od.* 19. 392-94.

αὐτίκα δ' ἔγνων  
οὐλὴν τὴν ποτὲ μιν σὺς ἤλασε λευκῇ ὀδόντι  
Παρνησόνδ' ἐλθόντα μετ' Αὐτόλοκον τε καὶ νίας  
and *Od.* 19. 464-66

ὥς μιν θηρεύοντ' ἔλασε σὺς λευκῇ ὀδόντι  
Παρνησόνδ' ἐλθόντα σὺν νίαισιν Αὐτόλοκιο

This type of "Ringkomposition" is discussed at length by W. A. A. van Otterloo in *Untersuchungen über Begriff, Anwendung und Entstehung der griechischen Ringkomposition* ("Mededeelingen der Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen," Afdeling Letterkunde, Deel 7, No. 3 [Amsterdam, 1944], reviewed in *CR*, LX [1946], 96). The Homeric passage is discussed on pp. 16-18.

4. For Wecklein's conjecture βούτας for οὐτως (718), which makes the parable point almost exclusively to Paris, see below.

5. Headlam-Thomson, *The Oresteia of Aeschylus*, II (Cambridge, 1938), 81-83; Verrall *Agamemnon* (2d. ed.; Macmillan, 1904), p. 92; Gilbert Murray *Aeschylus* (Oxford, 1940), p. 215; Franz Stössl, *Die Trilogie des Aischylos* (Baden bei Wien, 1937), p. 17.

6. Headlam-Thomson, *op. cit.*, p. 11 (on vs. 65).

7. The same tradition appears in Eur. *Cyclops* 181 ἐπεὶ γε πολλοὶς ἤδεται γαμουμένη.

8. *Op. cit.*, p. 82.

9. Not so the ancient. In the scholia which Triclinius calls σχόλια παλαιά (published by Dindorf in *Philologus*, XX [1863], 17-29, and printed as scholia to this portion of the play by Wecklein) there occurs a note on 718 ἔθρεψεν δὲ λέοντος which runs as follows ἡγουν ἀνέθρεψεν αὐτὸν ἀνὴρ τις ἐκτεθέντα τὸν Ἀλεξάνδρον λέγει.

10. *CR*, XVI (1902), 434ff.

11. Headlam (*op. cit.*, p. 82) quotes with approval Wecklein's defense of his conjecture — "without this word (βούτας) we should not know what 731 μηλοφόνουσιαν meant." But sheep are the traditional victims of the lion (cf. *Iliad* 5. 554-56, 10. 485, 12. 209-301, 303, 24. 41-43, *Odyssey* 6. 130-34), and μηλοφόνουσιαν supplies an expected detail.

12. See for example Headlam *op. cit.*, notes on 228-31, 339-40, 389-91 (p. 47), 1269-71, 1360, *CR*, XIV (1900), 12, col. 2.

13. See for example Headlam *op. cit.*, notes on 349, 707-10 (p. 81).

14. For οὐτως used to introduce a parable see Ar. *Vesp.* 1182, Plato *Phaedr.* 237 b (both cited by Headlam), and Ar. *Lysist.* 785.

15. *Op. cit.*, p. 29. Cf. also A. Y. Campbell, *Agamemnon* (London, 1940), p. 77. "There is reason to suppose that every mention of a lion in this play glances at some member of the family." This would have been a familiar figure to the Athenian audience of the Vth century; Herodotus has several passages in which a man is spoken of (or to) as a lion, cf. Her. 6. 13 ἐδόκεε δὲ λέοντα τεκεῖν (Pericles), 5. 56 τλήη λέων (addressed to Hipparchus), 5. 92 αἰετὺς . . . τέξεται . . . λέοντα καρτερόν ὠμηστήν (Cyrus).

16. Phobos appears on Agamemnon's shield in *Iliad* 11. 37.

17. Τρέφειν γυναῖκα, Eur. *I.A.* 749; ταύτας (i.e., πορνάς) τρέφειν, Diphilus 87 (Kock); ἔστιν δ' ἐταῖρα τῷ τρέφοντι συμφορά, Antiphanes 2 (Kock). Aegisthus is later addressed as γυναι (1625), and Clytemnestra is ἀνδρόβουλον κέαρ (11).

18. "The happy children loved him well," (Murray); "By the children loved" (Plumptre); "a fondling for the children's play" (Morshead); "the children's pet" (A. Y. Campbell); "the innocent sport of children" (Thomson). Headlam writes "the friend of childhood" and Verrall "made friends with youth."

19. Αἵματι δ' οἶκος ἐφόρθη is reminiscent of Agamemnon's account of his own murder in Homer, *Od.* 11. 420, δάπεδον δ' ἄπαν αἵματι ὕεν.

20. Headlam, *op. cit.*, on vss. 729-30.

21. So effectively that the MSS at Agamemnon 1258 read δῖπλους λέαννα, usually corrected to δῖπλους. (Porzig, *Die attische Tragödie des Aischylos* [Leipzig, 1926], argues unconvincingly for reading διπλοῦς.)

## NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

### ON "TRIBALLIC" IN ARISTOPHANES

(*Birds* 1615)

Some years ago (*HSCP*, XXXIX [1929], 1-6) I discussed an inscribed South Italic vase, showing that it contains a fragment of Dorian farce. I now learn that Altheim (*Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache* [1951], p. 427), like Krahe, whom he quotes, thinks that the plain Greek ὀλβεττήρ' ἄρον "Pick up the basket" is "komödienmessapisch." In this he apes A. D. Trendall (*Früh-italiotische Vasen* [1938], p. 25). But it is absurd for Trendall, who knows evidently no Messapic, to sit in judgement, even with Beazley to emulate. The retrograde direction of the writing is paralleled exactly by Walters (*Ancient Pottery*, II [1905], 262) (also Doric); and if it were not, still there is nothing in νοραρεττεβλο which can be Messapic. The word ὀλβεττήρ (i. e., ὀλ-φεττήρ) is justified in my paper already cited; cf. οἱ Δωριεῖς ὀλβακῆα (*ibid.*, p. 4), i. e., ὀλφακῆα.

But Trendall seeks to justify his "comedy Messapic" (comedy Messapic forsooth) by an appeal to what he considers Triballic in Aristophanes — comedy "Triballic" forsooth! He gives no reference. But the reference is plain. It is *Birds* 1615, 1627,

1677-78; and these (except 1615) are all as much Greek as ἐπιτριβεῖς in 1530. So the commentators; but it is Greek with a Thracian flavor (cf. *P-W*, s. v. "Thrake"; *Sprache* 410.40)

I write this note only because I have the correct reading at 1615 ναβαισατρεῦ, (the βαβακατρεῦ of Suidas is merely a further step in the corruption), which, it is suggested by Green and other editors, stands for νῆ with a divine name, in the accusative. That name, I now see, is the Thracian epithet of Zeus Βελοσοῦρδος, see *DAG*, 243, which may be a derivative of the pre-Keltic *belsa* "campus" of Virg. Tolos. (*ibid.*, 158). Cf. the local names *Belsa* (*ibid.*, 179, modern Beauce, Orléanais), *Belsinum* (Gers; *ibid.*, 84). Read, therefore, νῆ (or νᾶ?) Βελοσοῦρδον. The meaning is "Campestris," which is used of a god in *CIL*, II, 4083 (cf. VIII, 10760 with *Diz. Epigr.* 4.617, and *Campesium* in *EE*, IX, 1005, references which I owe to A. D. Nock). The alternation τρ: δρ between Greek and Thracian is normal.

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

### NOTE ON LUCAN 7.257-58.

haec est illa dies mihi quam Rubi-  
conis ad undas  
255 promissam memini, cuius spe movi-  
mus arma,  
in quam distulimus vetitos remeare  
triumphos,  
[haec eadem est hodie quae pignora  
quaeque penates  
reddat et emerito faciat vos Marte  
colonos]  
haec, fato quae teste probet, quis  
iustius arma  
260 sumpserit; haec acies victum factura  
nocentem est.

257 258 om. ZMUV et cum 256 et 259 (ob  
*arma* bis in fine positum) P, in quo man.<sup>2</sup>  
256 et 259 addidit, non hos duos; habent  
GZ<sup>2</sup>, non interpretantur c a, eiecit Ouden-  
dorpheus, ex 346-8 et I 340-5 ut videtur  
confictos. nec ferri potest *haec* (dies) *quae*  
*hodie reddat* et absurde versu 258 eis  
praedia quibus 265-7 ius mundi promittit:  
accedit ut his interpositis disiungantur  
sensus inter se coherentes.<sup>1</sup>

These lines form part of an exhortation  
addressed by Caesar to his veterans before  
the battle of Pharsalus. Verses 257-58 may  
be interpolated and are expelled by Hous-

man preceded by Oudendorp, Hosius, and others; but it is not clear that expulsion is the solution to the problem they present. Their omission by ZMUV can be explained adequately as caused by homoeoteleuton, homoearchon or a combination of both factors, the eye of the scribe passing from *triumphos* to *colonos* or from *haec* (257) to *haec* (259). They are not necessary to the grammar or meaning of the passage, and therefore when once omitted their chance of restoration would be lessened. It should also be observed that G, though heavily interpolated, does at the same time preserve a large amount of genuine tradition other MSS have failed to retain; with no other MS do the fourth-fifth century fragments N and II so often agree. Housman recognizes these facts and expels the verses wholly on internal grounds.<sup>2</sup>

The chief internal difficulty is caused by the word *hodie*, the expression *dies* ... *hodie* being so foreign to Lucan's style it seems impossible to disagree with Housman's judgment *nec ferri potest*. This difficulty however concerns a single word; it may be advantageous therefore to examine first the two general objections advanced against the lines.

The more substantial of these would seem to be the charge that it is absurd to promise grants of land to those to whom is promised also rule over the nations (265-67). But an examination of the verses concerned will prove the objection ill-founded:

- 261 si pro me patriam ferro flammisque  
petistis,  
nunc pugnate truces gladioque exsol-  
vite culpam:  
nulla manus, belli mutato iudice, pura  
est.  
non mihi res agitur, sed, vos ut libera  
sitis  
265 turba, precor gentes ut ius habeatis  
in omnes.  
ipse ego privatae cupidus me reddere  
vitae  
plebeiaque toga modicum componere  
civem ...

The thought is that the soldiers must be victorious in order to avoid the guilt of civil war and retain their freedom and the privileged place they enjoy as Romans among the nations of the earth; and that Caesar will retire to private life,<sup>3</sup> thus restoring its former powers to the Roman citizen body. In this there seems to be nothing making absurd the previous promise of land to each veteran. The soldiers are not to rule as individuals each with a grant of specific authority. Rather they are to rule the nations collectively as Roman citizens; the idea is as general as is Vergil's in *Romanos, rerum dominos, gentemque togatam* or *tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento*.<sup>4</sup>

When one passes to Housman's second point, while judgment becomes more subjective, it is difficult to understand in what sense the lines are supposed to interrupt the current of Caesar's thought. The whole passage emphasizes the crucial nature of the battle about to begin. In 254-56 its importance is presented chiefly from Caesar's point of view; in 257-58 from the point of view of the soldier; while in 259-60 the fate of commander and soldier alike is stressed if failure comes; *victum* takes in everyone.<sup>5</sup> Nor is any weight cast into the scale by Caesar's complaint that he has been deprived of his triumph and his soldiers of their lands (1. 340-45); or by Pompey's exhortation to his troops to fight if they wish to see their wives and children again (7. 346-48).

My own suggestion would be that 257-58 are genuine and *hodie* correct;<sup>6</sup> but that in 254 Lucan wrote *haec est illa acies*, which became corrupted into *haec est illa dies* throwing the passage into confusion. If *acies* is read for *dies*, all difficulty disappears: *hodie* is not only unobjectionable but pointed; and the one remaining blemish in the lines, the awkwardness of the anaphora *haec* (*dies*) ... *haec* ... *haec* ... *haec* (*acies*) is removed.<sup>7</sup>

G. D. PERCY

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

## NOTES

1. A. E. Housman, *M. Annaei Lucani Belli civilis libri decem* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1926), *ad loc.* In the *apparatus* of Housman's third edition (Leipzig: Teubner, 1913), of which Housman's *apparatus* is a selection, 257-58 are reported as added by the correctors of MV as well as Z.

2. *Op. cit.*, ix, xx-xxi.

3. The suggestion is part of the vilification of Caesar notable in Lucan. Caesar's actual state of mind has just been described as *aeger quippe morae flagransque cupidine regni* (240).

4. *Aen.* 1. 282; 6. 851.

5. Cf. 263. Housman is probably following Oudendorp (Leyden, 1728) who notes: *non apte inseritur hic mentio*

*militem, cum in seqq. versibus adhuc de se loquatur Caesar* .... But this is scarcely correct; and in any case Caesar turns from himself to his soldiers and back to himself again repeatedly throughout the speech. Note that 257-58 expand the idea first suggested by *remeare* (256), just as 261-63 follow naturally as a fuller expression of *nocentem* (260).

6. *Hodie* is to be taken with the clause that follows.

7. For a different point of view see G. Bernstein, *Die Versauslassungen in Lucans Bellum civile* (Jena Diss.; Borna-Leipzig: R. Noske, 1930), pp. 25-27. Bernstein argues that the verses are genuine, but supposes them to be a marginal addition made by Lucan after the speech had been composed; hence the confusion in the MSS tradition.

## AESCHYLUS AGAMEMNON 550

In the dialogue of Greek tragedy the syntax of a short speech is often dependent upon the syntax of the preceding speech. In Greek generally the antecedent of a relative pronoun may be omitted and the relative put into the case of the omitted antecedent.

Verse 549 of the *Agamemnon* reads

καὶ πῶς; ἀπόντων κοῖράνων ἔτρεῖς τινάς;

"How did that happen? Were you, during the absence of your king, in fear of some persons?"

The letters of verse 550 in the manuscripts are

ωννυντοσονδηκαιθανεινπολληχαρις.

Scaliger's (or Auratus') substitution of ὥς for ὦν and the word-division τὸ σὸν for τὸ-σον have altered the sense.

Scaliger's line (universally accepted, as far as I know)

ὥς νῦν, τὸ σὸν δῆ, καὶ θανεῖν πολλὴ χάρις

is translated by Fraenkel (*Aeschylus: Agamemnon* [Oxford, 1950]) as follows: "So much that now, in thine own words, even death were a great boon." But is it reasonable for the chorus to have been so frightened in the king's absence that now, upon his return, they wish to die? If their fears were not on the king's account but on their own — as they must have been while the king was at Troy, for τινάς in

this context could not mean Trojans — then the king's arrival ought to alleviate, not intensify those fears. And is it reasonable to go back eleven verses to 539 for an explanation of τὸ σὸν (if indeed verse 539 can be thought to explain τὸ σὸν)? In a persuasive note Fraenkel justifies δῆ in formulas of quotation, and although he obelizes that part of verse 539 upon which the explanation of τὸ σὸν δῆ would have to rest, he insists that the general meaning as given in his translation is clear.

Because ὦν (550) can be a relative the omitted antecedent of which was a partitive genitive with τινάς (549), because this partitive genitive contributes to the vagueness which the frightened chorus feels is necessary, and because νῦν (550) makes, with the imperfect ἔτρεῖς (549), a contrast sufficiently strong to justify the assumption of a verb "I fear" in 550, it is proposed here that the reading of the manuscripts be restored with the following word-division and the following translation:

ὦν νῦν τόσον δῆ· καὶ θανεῖν πολλὴ χάρις.

"(I feared some of those) whom, as a matter of fact, I now fear just as much. And death can bring great joy." The χάρις of verse 550 will be Clytemnestra's, not the chorus'.

C. ARTHUR LYNCH

BROWN UNIVERSITY

## AESCHYLUS AGAMEMNON 286

Editors do not agree upon the interpretation of verse 286 of the *Agamemnon* (references are made in this paper to the verses as numbered in Smyth's *Aeschylus* ["Loeb Classical Library"; New York, 1926]). The meaning of *νωτίσαι* is a cause of editorial disagreement; and the lack of a verb amid a plethora of subjects is a cause of editorial complaint.

Some aspects of the problem are revealed by the comments on verses 286–88 in *Notes to the Agamemnon of Aeschylus* (F. Fletcher, Oxford, 1949) which say in part, "As these lines stand in the MSS., with *πρύκην* τὸ at the beginning of 288, we seem to have two subjects and no verb with them. Wecklein's *ἡπεικτο* ('pressed onward'), which I adopt, avoids this difficulty and gets rid of the unnecessary τὸ before *χρυσοφεγγές*. *νωτίσαι*, which elsewhere means to 'turn the back' or 'cover the back', I take to mean here 'spread its light over' (not 'skim the surface', as L. and S. give, which would be inconsistent with *ὑπερτελής*, 'soaring high'). Headlam translates 'to clear the broad sea's back'."

The editorial dissensions, not all of which are presented by Fletcher, indicate that the text of this passage may be corrupt.

It is suggested here that the reading of

the manuscripts could easily have arisen from an uncial original which read

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18  
Π Ο Ν Τ Ο Ν Ω C C T Ε Ν Ο Ν Τ Ι C Ε

This text, which eradicates *νωτίσαι* and furnishes a verb, means "judged the sea narrow" or "ranked the sea narrow" or "treated the sea as narrow." The signal fire made little of the distance it traveled over water.

The verb *τίω* with *ὡς* and a predicate accusative (as required in the uncial line above) is not found elsewhere in Aeschylus, but *Iliad* 9. 302–3 read *οἱ σὲ θεὸν ὡς τίσουσ'.*

How, then, could *πόντον ὡς στενὸν τίσε*? The omission of one of the two consecutive C's (8 and 9 *supra*) would bring about the wrong division *ὥστε νοντισε*; the *ὥστε* thus created would demand the infinitive ending *-σαι*; and the necessity of making a recognizable verb form out of the remaining *νοντισαι* would produce *νωτίσαι*.

The reading proposed here, although it leaves some difficulties in the surrounding lines, does remedy the outstanding difficulties of the passage, and may deserve attention as a step in the right direction.

C. ARTHUR LYNCH

BROWN UNIVERSITY

## NOTES ON PSI 1307 AND 1308

The very able and distinguished papyrologist, Medea Norsa, has recently published two Latin military texts.<sup>1</sup> One of these, *PSI* 1307, contains parts of two columns. Only a few letters from the right edge of the first are preserved; the second column is more substantial but is incomplete on the right and below. There is nothing to indicate its original width, but the editor is doubtless correct in assuming that only half or less of the column has survived. Some lines project to the left and may indicate paragraphs, but too much is lost to understand the arrange-

ment of subject matter. On the basis of the hand Miss Norsa dates the text in the first century. One may add that the general absence of cognomina also points to an early date.

The text concerns assignments and activities of legionary soldiers, and Miss Norsa quite rightly cites *P Gen. Lat.* 1. The *Dura acta diurna*, which were not available to her, may also be compared.<sup>2</sup> There are, however, no dates or statements of strength in the columns extant.

One of the projecting lines (II, 17) is read by the editor as follows: *excubuerunt*



*ad aqu[u]lam et si q[ui]s. Aquila* is explained as a diminutive of *aqua*, meaning in this context perhaps a small stream or canal. But it seems better to read and restore: *excubuerunt ad aqu[i]lam et sig[na]*. What was taken to be the tail of a *q* may be explained as the oblique hasta of *m* or some such letter at the end of the line below. The men in this entry stood guard at the shrine housing the legion's eagle and standards.<sup>3</sup> This watch is already known from an inscription from Aquin-cum which mentions an *excubitorium ad tutel(am) signor(um) e[st] imagin(um) sacrar(um)*;<sup>4</sup> from the assignment *signis* in *P Gen. Lat.* 1;<sup>5</sup> and from the oath which is found in some of the Dura papyri: *parati erimus excubare ad signa domini nostri* . . .<sup>6</sup> Its appearance here is further evidence that it was a regular part of the military religion in all periods of the empire.

Another projecting line (5) in the same column has been read: *Bl[as]ebius T[usc]us habeatur primus inf[er]*. One may suggest that the name is followed by *hastatus primus*, i. e., the title of one of the ranking centurions in the legion.<sup>7</sup> It may be noted that the name and title of another centurion of high rank, the *princeps*, begin the following line.

Another suggestion affects several lines. It is that in a number of instances the character read as *i* is really the sign for *centurio* or *centuria*. In II, 19, e. g., for *iuari Turranius et tesserari*, one should read (*centuria*) *Vari Turranius* etc.; in II, 18 for *inerq Antistius i(n) servili seq[ue]*, (*centuria*) *Nes[i] Antistius (centuria) Servili Sem[pronius]?*<sup>8</sup> in II, 22 for *iuratu Lucretius*, (*centuria*) *Firmi Lucretius*; and perhaps in I, 5 for *imi Lepidian.*, *im (centuria) Lepidian.*<sup>9</sup> Other possible occurrences of the sign are in II, 16 after *Bassus*, in II, 11 and 21 after *Varius*, and in I, 14 after *Jiam*.<sup>10</sup>

On the basis of these readings, one may compare with our text an inscription from Coptos which lists centuries from the *III Cyrenaica* and from a second legion, perhaps the *XXII Deiotariana*.<sup>11</sup> It belongs to the early first century (Augustus

or Tiberius),<sup>12</sup> and hence is more or less contemporary with the papyrus. Among the 18 centuries of the second legion are (*centuria*) *Firmi* and (*centuria*) *Vari*, both in *cohors VI*.<sup>13</sup> Since the two names are so common, one cannot assume that the legion in the papyrus is necessarily that represented at Coptos. However, if the (*centuria*) *Neri* known in the *XXII Deiotariana* were found to belong to this same period, the grounds for identification would be much stronger.<sup>14</sup>

Some scattered observations on lines in column II may be worth recording. *Line 13*: — *ad pondera macelli duos ad ca[ss]*. Miss Norsa suggests that the men were possibly engaged in "sorveglianza annonaria," also comparing the *macellarios* in Vegetius 1. 7. Another parallel is found in *ILS*, 2415 (Lambaesis): . . . *signiferi leg(ionis) III Aug(ustae) agentes cura(m) macelli*. The supervision of weights need not have been connected with the *annona*. *Line 14*: — *unam quibus signum suu[m]*. Actually of the last three letters only the second is certain. *Signum* may mean "watchword" here, in which case it would be followed by the word in the genitive. *Line 15*: — *vigiles adnomera recognitos in[ter]*. The reading *ad nomen* (suggested by the editor in a note) seems better paleographically. Perhaps we have here an inspection and roll call; cf. Livy 28. 29. 12: . . . *stipendium ad nomen singulis persolutum est*.

*PSI* 1308, the second text, is so small a fragment that its precise character remains obscure; Miss Norsa showed good judgment in resisting the temptation to call it a *pridianum*. The column preserved is incomplete above, to the left, and below, but possibly not much of the beginnings of lines is lost. Some lines, usually indented, contain military ranks or consular dates ✓ or both; they evidently serve as headings for the names appearing in the other lines. The consular dates, one may assume, are dates of enlistment.

Miss Norsa assigns the papyrus to the third century on the basis of these dates, identifying *Avito cos* (l. 4), *Aspero cos* (l. 14), and *Anton[in]o [co]s* (l. 17) as consuls of

209, 212, and 213. Left unexplained, however, are *claro it' cos* (l. 2) and *Hom' cos* (l. 6). It seems better therefore to date the papyrus in the middle of the second century with the following identifications: *Claro it(erum) cos*: 146; *Avito cos*: 144; *Hom(ullo) cos*: 152. *Anto[ni]no [co]s* could be a consulship of Antoninus Pius quite as well as of Caracalla; however, the reading itself is doubtful. Further, if the year were 213, one would need *Antonino IIII cos*. *Anton[inu]s*, simply a soldier's cognomen, is perhaps the correct reading. *Aspero cos* apparently could only be one of the consuls of 212, but again the reading seems very questionable. The papyrus is so badly preserved at this point as to make any reading difficult. Following the initial *a*, however, there seem to be six letters, not

five; the last two might be either *to* or *t* and an abbreviation point. In any event, it seems impossible to reconcile *Aspero* with what can be seen on the photograph.

The offices and ranks in the headings should throw light on the nature of the document. *Caligati* (l. 13) designates a category of *milites*, roughly "enlisted men," and is not just a reference to their boots.<sup>15</sup> For *gub* in l. 4 it is difficult to suggest any expansion except *gub(ernator)* which would indicate that this is a list of sailors. *Fab(er)* or *fab(ri)* in l. 8 supports this possibility.<sup>16</sup> However, the only other well preserved heading, *ascita* (l. 11), is puzzling.

J. F. GILLIAM

STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

## NOTES

1. *Papiri Greci e Latini* (Pubblicazioni della Società Italiana per la ricerca dei Papiri greci e latini in Egitto [Florence, 1949]), XIII, Fasc. 1, 103-9. Because of Miss Norsa's unfortunate illness the fascicle was seen through the press by another.

2. J. F. Gilliam, *Yale Classical Studies*, XI (1950), 209-52. Cf. also *P Mich.* 455.

3. Their names presumably follow in the next two or three lines. The combination *aquila et signa* is of course quite common; see *TLL*, II, 372.

4. *ILS*, 2355 (A.D. 216).

5. See A. von Premerstein, *Klio*, III (1903), 43.

6. *Yale Classical Studies*, XI (1950), 230-36.

7. Cf. *ILS*, 2651: *has(tatus) pri(mus) leg(ionis) XX* (Dalmatia, before A.D. 10).

8. In (*centuria*) *Neri* only the first two letters of the name seem certain. For the name, cf. n. 14.

9. Cf. *Lepid[us]* at the end of II, 3.

10. In I, 14 *in* is a misprint for *i(n)*.

11. *CIL*, III, 6627 (with Mommsen's notes) = *ILS*, 2483. On the identity of the second legion, see J. Lesquier, *L'armée romaine d'Égypte d'Auguste à Dioclétien* (Cairo, 1918), pp. 45, 139; Ritterling, *RE*, XII, 1793, s.v. "Legio," who takes it to be the *XXII Deiotariana*.

12. On the date see Lesquier, *op. cit.*, p. 57 and the references in n. 11.

13. The latter may be the genitive of Varius, not Varus, as Lesquier, *op. cit.*, p. 550 and Ritterling, *loc. cit.*, 1797 assume. Cf. II, 11 and 21 of our text.

14. The century appears in a fragmentary, undated inscription, *CIL*, III, 6600. See Lesquier, *op. cit.*, pp. 136, 541; Ritterling, *loc. cit.*, 1797.

15. For the term, see *TAPA*, LXXVII (1946), 183-91.

16. For *gubernator* and *faber* as titles in the navy, see *ILS*, III, 1, p. 506; C. G. Starr, Jr., *The Roman Imperial Navy 31 B.C. — A.D. 324* (Ithaca, 1941), pp. 42, 51, 56, 60, 61, 65, n. 46.

## BOOK REVIEWS

---

*Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis: A Catalogue of the Inscriptions of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B.C.* Edited by ANTONY E. RAUBITSCHKE with the collaboration of LILIAN H. JEFFERY. Cambridge, Mass.: Archaeological Institute of America, 1949. Pp. xv + 545. \$ 15.00.

During the last generation epigraphical studies have made tremendous advances. We have learned to publish collections of documents by types; to supply adequate bibliography as well as photographs of all fragments; to study inscribed stones as monuments of more than a single dimension; to provide the reader with every possible means of control. On these principles Raubitschek, with the collaboration of Miss Lilian H. Jeffery, now publishes the inscriptions on the dedications of the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. found on the Athenian akropolis. The bulk of the responsibility is Raubitschek's (see p. x) and I am sure Miss Jeffery will not be offended if I direct most of my comments to him.

The 393 inscriptions are classified according to the monuments which they graced. Each classification receives a general introduction and each text is preceded by a brief description and exhaustive bibliography, and followed by commentary; the latter, too, is liberally punctuated with bibliography. The information contained in the dedications and texts is gathered and discussed in a series of valuable appendices, whose nature is suggested by the titles: "The Formulae of the Inscriptions," "Some Technical Aspects of the Early Attic Dedications," "The Early Akropolis Dedications as Historical Documents," and "Archaeological Summary." The book is equipped with a full set of indices.

The conception of the book is admirable and Raubitschek is an ingenious and patient worker who wrings the utmost from

a text, no matter how fragmentary it may be. The execution of the task, however, is not wholly faultless and raises certain important questions in my mind. So, having acknowledged the scholarship and effort represented by this volume, I shall not, I trust, be deemed wholly ungracious if I dwell upon its shortcomings. For, although we have progressed markedly in epigraphic method, there is ground still to be won before we can rest in satisfaction.

On p. 448, in a discussion of letter forms, Raubitschek refers to his "attempt... to present a relative chronology together with illustrations which make the reader independent from the assertions and conclusions suggested here." But this is precisely what he has not done, and in all too many cases the critical reader, eager to pursue an argument based on letter forms, must search for photographs in other publications. We are told (p. 8), for example, to "Notice the Ionic forms of lambda and sigma and the shape of the phi" in No. 3, which is not illustrated; must the reading of such a book as this be restricted to a well stocked library? I am aware that it is not always easy to obtain photographs; yet a serious effort ought to have assured better results than this.

On the other hand, several of the monuments are accompanied by drawings or tracings; these are often instructive, sometimes pointless. Why is No. 303 honored with a tracing (p. 327), when only a fragmentary sigma is extant? More flagrant is the treatment of No. 301 (IG, I<sup>2</sup>, 396), a two-lined fragmentary dedication noting the despatch of a colony to Er[-]. Raubitschek employs a full page (p. 324) for his tracing; in it he restores EP[ETPIAN], but he prints in his text 'Ep[ετρίαν vel -υρίαν] (his accentuation). He then states that with his preferred restoration "its second line is two letters longer than the

first," and cites a parallel. As it happens, he has probably chosen the wrong alternative; the case will be argued in the third volume of *The Athenian Tribute Lists* (in press as this review is written). And the absence of Eretria from Period III might have made him chary of denying evidence in the tribute lists of a colony (or klerouchy ?) after 446 B.C. The tracing is sheer waste.

The handling of No. 135b is typical of Raubitschek's fondness for riding two horses with consequent failure to achieve a firm seat on either. This penchant is seen at its worst on pp. 150-51. In the first place Kimon almost certainly did not return from ostracism in 457 B.C.; Raubitschek does not even hint that there is a problem, finding 457 an apt date for his purpose of the moment. Then, he seems to like Mayor's thesis that the Athenian generals entered office before the end of February (it enables him to add a biographical detail concerning Xenophon son of Euripides). Yet Pritchett's answer to Mayor is a strong one; it is accepted by Ehrenberg (*AJP*, LXVI [1945], n. 39 on pp. 128-29) and, it would seem, by Larsen (*CP*, XLI [1946], n. 18 on pp. 95-96), and deserves more than a passing and self-protective reference. Finally, because it is temporarily convenient, Raubitschek flirts with Gelzer's rather disreputable view that this same Xenophon wrote the anonymous *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία* and, citing an equally disreputable date, wanders into an irrelevant discussion of the pamphlet. This fickle reluctance to take a stand, coupled with his habit of piling detail upon theories that in other circumstances he would hesitate to favor, inspires antipathy in the reader.

Similar is the tendency towards the "double recension" demonstrated in the commentary (p. 59) on No. 57: "The shorter form  $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$  for  $\epsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$  was already in use at that time [ca. 480 B.C.], in Attika as well as elsewhere." But the restoration printed is the proper name  $\Theta\epsilon\lambda\omicron\chi[\acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\varsigma]$ . Compare p. 73 (on No. 68), where the purpose of the reference to *IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 823 is obscure, with Raubitschek's present reading

of his text. Again, his commentary (p. 6) on No. 2 is incomprehensible, for here the closed form of the *spiritus asper* does not appear. And on p. 340 (on No. 317) the date 540/39 is adopted for the second return of Peisistratos, whereas on p. 492 it has become 539/38. In this connection (the dating of Peisistratos) Raubitschek would do well to consult Adcock, *CQ*, XVIII (1924), pp. 174-81. On p. 422 the author refers for the meaning and significance of  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\rho\chi\acute{\eta}\nu$  and  $\delta\epsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\nu$  to Beer and Nilsson; but on p. 424 he cites, in almost the same terms, Rouse and Geffcken.

The most common expressions in this book are "it is tempting" and "it may be assumed" (*vel sim.*). It should be said at once that Raubitschek is not the man to resist temptation; cf. Nos. 15, 72, 132, 212. The epigraphist today deals with the most vital and perhaps the only new evidence that is likely to be granted to the historian. He must therefore exercise the most scrupulous caution. He must never feel embarrassment when he leaves a text without restoration; and he must specify clearly when his supplements are printed by way of example. Even the latter aim at reproduction of the original, however, and when I read, as on p. 6 (on No. 2), "The restoration does not pretend to be correct," I feel that it should not have been included in the text. No. 103 has an initial letter as the sole survivor in each of three lines. The commentary (p. 107) reads: "The restoration is uncertain," surely a gem of understatement. Cf. Nos. 214, 215, 281.

The readings and reconstructions are more than daring. I should myself like to see the epigraphic dot of uncertainty employed with greater freedom; cf., eg., Nos. 1, 57, 149, 155, 169, 326. In No. 61 I cannot see the evidence for the two dots of punctuation after  $\pi\rho\omicron\tau\omicron\nu$ . The reading of No. 147 is wrong. The restoration (unmetrical) of No. 148, preferred to Friedländer's (metrical), produces lines of unequal length. Why is not the upsilon printed in No. 325?

Some of the comments on meter are

puzzling. No. 6 does not contain eight dactyls in its second line. Nor is it very penetrating to account for a line of eight dactyls by "the great amount of information which has been crowded by the poet into this one line" (p. 12); one might as well say that the line contains a lot of words. The commentary on No. 67 (p. 71) I do not understand; cf. Nos. 82 (p. 88), 46 (p. 49). The author does not hesitate to call an inscription metrical on very slim evidence; cf. Nos. 149 (p. 167), 214 (p. 245).

There are also more errors than one would expect in a volume which was in manuscript as long ago as 1940 and which presumably has been subject to revision over a period of years. The dates given on p. vii for Kirchhoff's work are incorrect. In No. 3 (p. 8) omicron for omega is also an Attic touch. The reasons for the unique spacing of the last line in No. 46 are set out in reverse on p. 48; in fact, space forbade adherence to the stoichedon pattern and the "harmony" is quite accidental. Raubitschek refers throughout to *Epigrammata*, by Friedländer and Hoffleit; but the former's name is not once spelled correctly and the latter receives credit only on p. 431. On p. 150 he appeals to *Athenian Studies Presented to W. S. Ferguson*, on p. 449 (and elsewhere) to the same volume under a different title and with an erroneous date. In general the spelling is Greek, though not consistently so; cf. "Cyzicus" on p. 125, "Koronea" on p. 203, "Thoukydides" on p. 493 and "Thukydidēs" elsewhere.

Raubitschek's command of the bibliography is encyclopedic; his employment of this knowledge, however, needs discipline. Citations are excessive and hence rather uneven in quality. I do not believe that the mention of a subject or problem should automatically admit an author to a scholarly bibliography. The listing of text books (some of doubtful origin) suggests ostentation and tends to submerge studies of genuine worth.

The book is crammed with interpretation, naturally, and most of it is admirable, despite a characteristic urge to pass beyond reasonable conjecture. Some stirs

doubt. On p. 340 it is observed that Megakles must have been at least 35 years old in 550 when his daughter married Peisistratos; he must have been a good deal more than this, for his own marriage to Agariste cannot be placed much later than 575 B.C. Raubitschek (p. 329 on No. 306) suggests that ἐποίκοι and ἀποίκοι, to Thucydides, differed in meaning; the difference, probably, is between "immigrants" and "emigrants." An inscribed ostrakon does not prove that an ostracism took place; Raubitschek belatedly corrects himself on this point in his discussion of Kallias son of Didymias on p. 183, but by p. 463 he has forgotten his reservation. The first hexameter of No. 168 does not emphasize to me "that the monument was erected not from spoils but from the ransom" (p. 193). I should also question whether "an increasingly democratic society . . . existed at Athens from the time of Solon" (p. 464). In the same context Raubitschek writes these sentences: "Since political activity was linked with considerable wealth in earlier times, the members of the aristocracy were, or at least had been, rich. The educational and cultural element, which plays a more important part in the modern conception of aristocracy, was then almost exclusively confined to participation in the great Hellenic games." I am not sure that I understand this, especially the second sentence; if I do, I am sure I disagree strongly.

The English could be improved and would thus add clarity. The awkward and incorrect "as to" is common. Other blemishes occur on pp. 43 ("Parthenos" for "Athena" can scarcely occur "for the first time" in three separate documents), 190 ("unaccounted prytaneis"), 322 (commentary on No. 298), 357 (singular for plural). The discussion of the demes on pp. 467-68 is unnecessarily involved.

I note errors that slipped by in the proof on pp. 49 ("troche"), 167 (line 3), 203 (last two lines transposed), 291 (last line), 355 (read ἀγών), 235 (accent of θυγάτηρ), 231 (read "Nem."), 251 (read "iambi"), 457 (read "Supplement"), 479 (read "pedes-



tal"). The punctuation is frequently inconsistent; here and there the type is broken (e.g., pp. 9, 76, 136, 344).

The Index, of considerable detail, has been carefully prepared; the only error I have observed is the entry *IG, I<sup>2</sup>, 199+207+208* on p. 544. The study as a whole needs a Table of Abbreviations.

A book of this nature is an important contribution to epigraphic progress and to our understanding of the Hellenes; it tends to become a standard work of reference. And in this case the author has, in the appendices, rendered a particularly interesting and notable service by his thorough analysis of his materials. Here he studies the monuments, their physical characteristics, and the artists named; he is thus enabled to add scores of details to our knowledge of the Athenian potters and their profession as well as of the dedicators. The appendix as a whole supplements the already full individual commentaries. I think it is here that Raubitschek has made the most significant advance in method.

Raubitschek's enthusiasm leads him frequently into recklessness; nevertheless, his book has great merit and belongs in every epigraphist's library.

MALCOLM F. MCGREGOR

*University of Cincinnati*

---

*Man in his Pride: A Study of the Political Philosophy of Thucydides and Plato.* By DAVID GRENE. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950. Pp. xiv + 231. \$ 4.00.

This is an ambitious book. It is also an interesting and thoughtful book, although it is an impressive attempt rather than a satisfactory achievement. The attempt, as the abstract on the cover tells us, was directed towards "seeing fifth century Athens through the eyes of Thucydides and Plato"; but this narrows the issue too much, and we had better accept the more general implication of the subtitle. With this, the main title (taken from a poem by Yeats) fits well. The book is con-

cerned with that period of anthropocentric thought which is dominated by the figure of Socrates, first the living and then the dead Socrates. Politics then for the first time had become a subject of theoretical thought, and though this was largely due to the sophists, it is right—partly, but not solely, because of the fullness of our evidence—to turn to Thucydides and Plato to study its deeper strata.

Thus, the book is naturally divided into two sections, and while it seems adequate to speak of Thucydides under the heading of "The Man who looked on," it is never explained and may puzzle readers who have forgotten *Rep.* 496 D why Plato is called "The Man in the Duststorm." Such coining of halfpoetical and unusual phrases, frequently vague and sometimes even unintelligible, is a significant feature of the whole book. It would be unfair to call it for that reason unscholarly; but it must be said that too much of the argument is expressed in terms which make it difficult to follow the author's reasoning, and more than once the impression can hardly be avoided that emotional and irrational language takes the place of cool and reasoned argument. This is particularly so in the Plato section, and I must confess that there I sometimes felt out of my depth (though the fault may not be entirely on one side). I hasten, however, to add that frequently Professor Grene finds particularly happy and striking phrases.

A full account of the contents of the book, although it is not a long one, cannot be given, if only because an adequate *résumé* could not be brief enough for a short review, and if it could, it would distort the intricate and complex texture of Professor Grene's argument. Thus, a few important points alone will be discussed, but I hope they will truly reflect the character and the undeniable originality of the book.

Athenian politics before and during the time of the Peloponnesian War, as Grene tries to show, were pure and undisguised power politics. Neither Roman nor British imperialism can be compared as they were both ruled by some kind of

"philosophy" which made the empire the outcome of a genuine belief in one's own cultural superiority. There was nothing comparable in the Athenian empire; the embellishment of the ruling city created eternal values, but it seems very doubtful whether even that can be taken as a justification of imperialism. The decisive point is that the Athenian imperialists did not regard it in that way; on the contrary, they openly admitted Athenian "tyranny" over the allies. Political theory there was, but it did not—as so frequently—serve a political power by throwing a cloak over its real nature. Athenian political thought culminated in the theory of the right of the stronger and the ideal of the tyrannical man. "The tyranny which haunted the minds of fifth-century Athenians and took shape tentatively in Alcibiades and actually in Critias... was a philosophically conceived monster bred of the collapse of any collective political morality." But was it only "a cynical joke of history" that this "philosophical growth" remained insignificant in practical politics?

One of the causes of the development just described was, according to Thucydides, democracy. Professor Grene sees this, though it is unfortunate that he sometimes is not certain about his facts (e.g., were the Five Hundred still chosen by a mixed procedure of election and lot?). More important, however, is that he regards Athenian politics simply as the struggle of two parties which "the issues of the empire, international commerce, trade as opposed to agriculture, universal as opposed to limited franchise, split... like a knife." This, to put it mildly, is greatly exaggerated, and when we also learn that "the administration in the person of the ten generals embodies something which we could call party administration," we suddenly realize that the picture reflects the general outlines of American rather than Athenian politics. It is remarkable how little those so-called party politics actually influenced the composition of the board of the strategi. Nobody can deny that Thucydides' sympathies are with the

conservatives rather than the radicals, but he was not "an anticipation of the later oligarchic philosophy" (whatever that may mean).

Even more significant than Thucydides' attitude to democracy are his views on the empire. The issue of the morality of power politics, as Professor Grene rightly stresses, "does not clearly divide oligarchs from democrats," and "the anti-imperialist position of the conservative wing [?] is more or less forced upon them." Grene detects behind Thucydides' position the knowledge "that the inspiration toward power, both in the individual and the nation, is the most basic of human qualities." That is to say, "historical necessity" is at work, and war in all its forms is its result, tragic but inevitable. If the empire was a major cause of the war, it was itself a product of historical necessity. The mark of statesmanship (which the historian can explain to later generations) is to understand the inevitable consequences of "men's fear, honor, and greed," and thus to face the next contingency (which no one can prevent from happening) with as much skill and wisdom as possible.

This philosophy of history, pessimistic or perhaps rather realistic, is not the whole story as far as Thucydides is concerned. In a stimulating chapter, Grene somewhat artificially combines the evidence of three very different passages in order to reveal the extent to which Thucydides allows for the interference of chance. He even speaks of Thucydides' awe in the face of the ironies of chance, and discovers pity and moral judgment in the historian's dealing with events (and with such events only) which are outside the control of necessity. The attitude of "it might have been different if..." makes no sense unless there is a true freedom of choice. And yet, there is still something beyond necessity. We cannot appreciate the genius of great men of action without the belief in some essential freedom of the will. Thus, Grene finds that in Thucydides' philosophy, the creative work of the great statesmen from Themistocles onwards represents what is

outside both of necessity and of chance. When he deals with Pericles as he emerges from his three speeches in Thucydides, I find myself in full agreement with his picture of the man whose greatness is one of "complete personal responsibility without the blessing of divine sanction or hereditary legitimacy." Pericles was above the fear and the greed, and it is this that gives the man and his work that unique position which Thucydides with all his heart admired, and with which he vied in the austerity and courage of his own work.

It is perhaps easier to elucidate the political philosophy of the historian than that of the philosopher. That, at least, is the impression one gets from Grene's book; the common view is rather the opposite. Grene tries as far as possible to isolate Plato's political thought from the whole of his philosophy; but his own book is ample proof that this is impossible. Those who praise or condemn Plato for his political philosophy (largely identifying it with certain modern doctrines) usually misrepresent him because they look at special parts rather than at the whole. Grene never attempts to systematize either the *Republic* or the *Laws*. In a kind of philosophical biography, with full regard to the decisive events of Plato's life, to the unique form of the dialogues and Plato's attitude to the art of writing, above all with full regard to the stages of his philosophical development, Grene discusses a number of aspects of his theme all of which make some contribution to the total picture. This contribution is not always quite clear, and some of the conclusions remain highly hypothetical. Nevertheless, he gives us a good deal to think and to re-think.

For various reasons it is impossible for me to reproduce Grene's argument in this section even to the limited extent possible in the case of Thucydides. It would be worth while, for instance, to discuss in some detail the remarks on Plato's "true rhetoric" and its relations to *Eros*. But I had better concentrate on what seems to me the most remarkable result, though here, too, much remains hypothetical: the development of

the political planner from the *Republic* to the *Laws*. This is usually traced as a development from the almost Utopian to the deliberately practicable. Grene opposes this view. He rightly takes the *Republic* rather than any later book as an attempt at planning with the aim of putting the scheme into practice. It is the state of the *Republic* which forms the basis for all the futile attempts in Syracuse. In the earlier parts of the *Republic* Grene sees "the model or the mechanical-toy state," which (as shown in the later parts) can be brought to realization by the philosopher-king. He can be educated, and thus become "the expedient for bringing the model state to life," while the guardians are merely "the puppets who will go through the proper motions in the imaginary city." Plato, however, neither in theory nor in practice, found an answer to the question how to bring his well-trained philosophical ruler into active contact with those he was to rule. When in his very old age Plato once more returned to the problem of the best state, "the drive to realization was spent." Now "he can give thought and care to the details of what will never come to pass." It is a fine and consistent construction, and in Grene's own treatment not quite so simplified as it may appear from this *résumé*. Still, it is a subject for careful and extensive investigation rather than for an essay which in an equally sweeping manner deals with a number of other Platonic dialogues. One need not be an expert on Greek philosophy (a claim the reviewer can certainly not make) in order to feel that many of Grene's ingenious arguments are not yet safely founded. Much is left out—naturally enough; but I regret that, for example, the picture in the *Statesman* of the πολιτικὴ τέχνη is completely neglected.

Grene rejects the view that Plato in his old age became scientific and practical. His own version, though not entirely new, is based on a number of original and interesting observations. It is useful to be reminded how improbable the assumption is that the man who wrote *Philebus* and

*Timaheus* also thought of the pedantry of the *Laws* as something to be put to practical use. If the Plato of the *Laws* seems "different from any we have known," this will be so partly because "the old man had at last exhausted the tension of his creativity." If that seems not quite sufficient to explain the particular character of the *Laws*, we may with Grene turn to Plato's remark, however incidental it may be, that this work of his was "the object of a sober old man's game" (685 A). The *Laws* are not a textbook for constitutional and administrative practice; they may be the intellectual game of a superb brain no longer intent on the purposeful drive toward uniting "life and design."

It will have become clear that Grene's book has obvious and considerable weaknesses, that it is uneven in its treatment, that it does not fully live up to its pretensions. There are also a few factual errors such as the dates of the Dorian Migration (p. 164) and of Thucydides' generalship (p. 55). In spite of all this, the book is well worth studying, though one would have wished that the author had displayed in greater detail and clarity the course of his own labors. As it is, the reader, though impressed by the courage and the independence of mind with which the great questions of the subject are being tackled, will finish the book very much like a man still hungry after a dinner which consisted of *hors d'œuvre* only.

VICTOR EHRENBERG

London

*Naevius poeta: Introduzione biobibliografica, testo dei frammenti e commento.* Edited by ENZO V. MARMORALE. ("Biblioteca di studi superiori, Filologia latina," Vol. VIII.) 2d ed. Firenze: "La nuova Italia," 1950. Pp. 268. L. 1300.

The first edition of this penetrating and substantial study was published in Catania early in 1945; owing to the war it did not attract the attention it merited, particularly outside of Italy. The present re-edition

has been improved by the addition of a bibliography and indices, the notes have been placed at the foot of the page instead of in the text, and the commentary to the fragments has been revised and augmented in many places. In every essential respect, however, the work remains the same. The greater part of the extensive introduction examines problems bearing on the biography of the poet (pp. 15-143); the remainder (pp. 143-81) deals with his plays and epic poem. This is followed by the fragments of Naevius' works, together with *apparatus* and commentary.

It is cogently argued that Naevius was by birth a Capuan (pp. 15-21). Gellius (*NA* 1. 24. 3) characterizes the epitaph that Naevius supposedly wrote for himself as "*plenum superbiae Campanae*" and in the next paragraph cites the first book of Varro's *De poetis* as the source of an analogous epitaph attributed to Plautus; therefore Gellius may be assumed to have derived "*plenum superbiae Campanae*" from Varro's *De poetis* as well. Until Livy's time "Campanus" meant "Capuan" rather than "Campanian" (p. 17 and n. 7). Consequently Varro attested Naevius' Capuan origin. Thus Marmorale, in both the 1945 and 1950 editions. In a recent article, however, H. T. Rowell points out that it is by no means self-evident, as Marmorale believes, that the characterization in Gellius stems from Varro;<sup>1</sup> it is, he inclines to consider, Gellius' own judgment, probably influenced by Ciceronian references to Capuan *superbia*; nevertheless Varro was Gellius' source for the statement that Naevius was "Campanus," and "Campanus" to Varro meant "Capuan."<sup>2</sup> Marmorale mentions this article several times, but apparently does not grasp the precise problem about which it centers.<sup>3</sup> Rowell's de-

1. "The 'Campanian' Origin of Cn. Naevius and its Literary Attestation," *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, XIX (New Haven, 1949), 17.

2. *Ibid.*, pp. 20-21 and 31.

3. P. 3, n. 11: "Il Rowell cita... il mio *Naevius*, ma non deve averlo letto attentamente, se, pur dicendo quasi sempre le stesse cose da me dette nello studiare le fonti della biografia di Nevio, afferma che il suo è il primo studio completo delle fonti stesse (p. 17), che le opinioni anteriori alla sua ma con la sua concordanti sono solo 'casuali' piuttosto che risultati di un'indagine metodica

monstration, in any event, reinforces beyond possibility of cavil the persuasive case made by Marmorale. Like his fellow townsmen prior to the punitive measures taken by the Romans in 210 B.C., the poet was a Roman citizen without voting privileges (pp. 21-26).

To the established data on Naevian chronology Marmorale adds the hypotheses that Naevius served under P. Claudius Pulcher in 249 B.C., and that he was stationed at Agrigentum at the time of the Carthaginian assault of 254 (pp. 26-39). The first is inferred from Frag. 45 (47)<sup>4</sup> of the *Bellum Punicum*: "superbiter contemptim conterit legiones." This had been suggested as a possibility by C. Cichorius,<sup>5</sup> who gives good reasons for referring the verse to Claudius, consul in 249. Marmorale contends (pp. 38-39) that the indignation here apparent makes it "anything but improbable" that Naevius was part of Claudius' force at the time of the latter's disastrous attack on Drepanum. Possibly so, but it might also be advanced that had this been the case, the poet would in all likelihood have been killed or captured in the fiasco.<sup>6</sup> Naevius' presence at Agrigentum in 254 also rests upon a number of superimposed hypotheses, but is of much greater intrinsic probability. The hint is given by Frag. 19 (7): "inerant signa expressa, quomodo Titani, / bicorpores Gigantes magnique Atlantes / Runcus ac Purpureus filii Terras" which became of cardinal importance in reconstructing the poem upon its being shown by H. Fraenkel<sup>7</sup> to be a description of the temple of Zeus at Agrigentum; this identification enabled L.

Strzelecki to make his thesis that the poem began with the opening phase of the first Punic war, and that the story of Aeneas was inserted as an apologue, much stronger than would otherwise have been possible.<sup>8</sup> The fragment is assigned by Priscian to the first book of the *Bellum Punicum* and indicates that the siege of Agrigentum in 262 B.C. was here included. In a postscript to a note on Naevius' epic published three years later, A. Klotz raised the possibility that a description of the decorations of the temple of Zeus at Agrigentum, which are known to have included scenes from the Trojan war, introduced the tale of Aeneas, but prefers the hypothesis that the transition was effected apropos of the presence of the Romans in Segesta in 260.<sup>9</sup> Marmorale in 1945<sup>10</sup> and shortly thereafter Rowell<sup>11</sup> independently developed Klotz's suggestion; both conclude that it represents the truth. Marmorale further supposes that Naevius belonged to the Roman detachment at Agrigentum at the time of the Punic *coup de main* of 254. Except for the siege eight years before, this is the only time Agrigentum comes into prominence during the war; in 262 Naevius, who lived until the end of the century, could hardly have reached military age; the vividness of the description indicates that he had seen the temple with his own eyes. It is unlikely that Naevius had time for sightseeing during his Sicilian service; it may therefore be conjectured that he observed the temple while on duty in Agrigentum in 254. (Despite the attractiveness of this theory, it must be remembered that we do not know that there was a Roman detachment in Agrigentum in 254, much less the period during which it

*ibid.*." But Rowell is here speaking only of the views of various scholars, including Marmorale, regarding the source of the comment in Gellius 1. 24. 3 on the epitaph attributed to Naevius, not of the totality of sources for the biography of the poet.

4. In this and following citations from the *Bellum Punicum*, the first number is that in W. Morel's *Fragmenta poetarum latinorum* (Leipzig, 1927), the one in parentheses that of the present edition.

5. *Römische Studien* (Leipzig, 1922), p. 45.

6. See Polybius 1. 51 for the heavy personnel losses (about two thirds) suffered by the Romans in this affair.

7. "Griechische Bildung in altrömischen Epen II," *Hermes*, LXX (1935), 50-61.

8. *De Naeviano belli Punici carmine quaestiones selectae* (Cracow, 1935), pp. 10-11. Previously it had been generally believed that the poem began with the story of Aeneas and did not come to the war itself before the third book, a theory which made it necessary to displace three of the eleven fragments assigned to one of the first three books on ancient authority.

9. "Zu Naevius' bellum Punicum," *Rh. Mus.*, LXXXVII (1938), 190-92.

10. See pp. 89-91 of the 1945 edition and pp. 30-33 of the present one.

11. "The Original Form of Naevius' *Bellum Punicum*," *AJP*, LXVIII (1947), especially pp. 32-39.



may have been stationed there.) This would place his birth some twenty years earlier, which is consistent with what is known of the poet's chronology.

For the first three books of the *Bellum Punicum* Marmorale follows Strzelecki's order with few changes. Frag. 34 (6) he accepts as Naevian and relates with Cichorius to the siege of Agrigentum, whereas Strzelecki had followed the MSS of Festus which attribute it to Ennius; Frag. 17 (9) he places at the departure of Aeneas from Troy; Strzelecki had tentatively assigned it to the prologue. This is a statement from Servius Danielis (*Aen.* 9. 712) that Naevius in the first book of his epic had said that the island Prochyta was named after Aeneas' sister. Marmorale believes that this sister would figure in the exodus, and that this furnished the pretext for the aetiological detail. This is reasonable. In the second book Frags. 7 (25), 8 (26) and 9 (27), which Strzelecki does not include in the first three books, Marmorale inserts after the fourth fragment of the second book (10 [24]). The first of the three is clearly appropriate here; the other two are so fragmentary that it is hard to form an opinion. For the five fragments of the third book Marmorale follows the Strzeleckian order without change.

The famous "blande et docte percentat Aenea quo pacto / Troiam urbem liquerit" (23 [28]), which is assigned by Nonius to Book 2, Marmorale, with Strzelecki, takes to refer to Dido. He is surely right. In the first edition Verg. *Aen.* 1. 748-53 are here cited with the comment "I neviani blande et docte non vi sono più, ma la loro eco rimane ancora nei versi di Virgilio" (p. 103\*); in the present one, there has been added the acute observation "che però già ottanta versi prima aveva messo a partito il blande neviano: cf. *Aen.* I 670 sg. *nunc Phoenissa tenet Dido blandisque moratur vocibus*" (p. 246).

For the last four books and the fragments of uncertain position Marmorale's presentation corresponds for the most part with that of Morel. Frag. 63 (58), which Leo had not accepted as a Saturnian and

which Morel had excluded from the poem has, as a result of E. Fraenkel's demonstration (*RE*, Suppl., VI, 640) been readmitted. It is surprising to find the familiar "fato Metelli Romae fiunt consules" (46) in the *Bellum Punicum*. Marmorale argues (pp. 63-71) that although the verse appears to be a senarius it was not part of a play, for it was not Naevius' practice to attack people by name from the stage;<sup>12</sup> that, *pace* Leo and his followers, the verse is an acceptable Saturnian; finally, it stood in the sixth book of the *Bellum Punicum* and referred to L. Caecilius Metellus, consul in 251 and 247 B.C. *Fato*, he believes, meant in the epic "by the will of the gods who wished to save Rome" (p. 69). At the time of the election of the Q. Caecilius Metellus who was consul in 206 the verse was lifted from its context and slyly circulated as propaganda against the consul (whether with or without the poet's consent Marmorale does not say); from Metellus or his entourage it elicited the equally well known Saturnian in reply. This is farfetched. If the Metelli could post (Marmorale reminds us that this has been shown to be the meaning of Pseudo-Bassus' *proposuerunt* [pp. 86-87]) a single Saturnian of their own in reply to the Naevian verse, the poet could by the same token have composed and posted his Saturnian shortly before.<sup>13</sup> The truth would seem to be that the epigram was designed to be as comprehensive a lampoon as possible, aimed principally against the consul of 206 but not excluding the two Metelli who had previously held the consulship. The first of these was L. Caecilius Metellus Denter, who attempted to attack Arretium during his consulship in 284 and

12. Cic. *Rep.* 4. 10-12, discussed pp. 50-51, furnish stronger evidence that Naevius did not attack from the stage *nominatim* than Gellius' statement (of Varroian origin) in 3. 3. 15 that the poet was jailed "ob assiduum maledicentiam et probra in principes civitatis de Graecorum poetarum more dicta" does to the contrary. It will be noted that the iambic septenarii which according to Gellius (7. 8. 5) Naevius directed against Scipio and according to Marmorale (p. 105) preceded and may have determined his incarceration do not mention Scipio by name.

13. Cf. E. Paratore, *Storia della letteratura latina* (Florence, 1950), p. 32.

was catastrophically defeated,<sup>14</sup> the second L. Caecilius Metellus, consul in 251 and 247. In the year following his first consulship this Metellus won an important victory at Panormus, and whatever else is known about him is to his credit. Nevertheless Naevius, as an enlisted veteran of the Sicilian war, may not have shared the high regard in which this dignitary was held by the general public. Pseudo-Asconius characterizes this verse as "dictum facete et contumeliose in Metellos,"<sup>15</sup> that is, insulting to the Metelli and cleverly so. To a Roman of 206 *fato* would imply that it was through no merit of his own that Metellus had become consul, and that his consulship boded no good for Rome; the verse would further carry an unpleasant reminder of the disastrous consulship of the first Metellus and cast a gratuitous slur upon the second one. A verse so ingeniously packed with venom must have been composed with malice aforethought.

Marmorale is at his most persuasive when he maintains that Naevius was not imprisoned in 206 as a direct consequence of this jibe, but by an act of *arbitrium* on the part of Q. Caecilius Metellus during his brief dictatorship at the end of 205. Metellus was acting on behalf of Scipio to punish Naevius for his attacks on the aristocratico-demagogic party of which Scipio was the leading figure (pp. 91-112), culminating that year in the scurrilous verses which Gellius (7. 8. 5) quotes with the remark that they were directed against Scipio. Naevius was released early in 204 through the good offices of the tribune M. Claudius Marcellus, son of the distinguished commander the poet had celebrated in his *Clastidium* (pp. 124-31).

The fragments of the plays are well presented and explained. Professor Marmorale has done scholarship a great service in providing a modern critical and exegetical edition of this significant poet; the exhaustive introductory essay constitutes one even greater. It is thoroughly documented, forthright and thought out with

rare ingenuity. Whether the author's reasoning convinces or not, and except where the evidence is hopelessly inadequate it usually does, there is never any uncertainty as to where he stands and why.

RICHARD T. BRÜERE

University of Chicago

*Griechische Grammatik*, Zweiter Band: *Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*. By EDUARD SCHWYZER †. Vervollständigt und herausgegeben von ALBERT DEBRUNNER. (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, herausgegeben von WALTER OTTO †. Zweite Abteilung, Erster Teil, Zweiter Band.) München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagbuchhandlung, 1950. Pp. xxiv+714. DM 48; bound, DM 54.

Müller's *Handbuch*—only in German does a handbook fill a shelf, or a *Grundriss* run to six volumes—Müller's no longer, but † Otto's (whose next?), like the Federal budget, grows by what it feeds on. The Greek grammar, originally (1885) but a part of a subdivision for which a single volume sufficed, is now inflated to two volumes of 1556 pages, without the indexes that are to make a third by themselves; and without the indexes it is now well-nigh impossible to find any particular tree in this tremendous forest. The third edition was called for but a mere decade and a half after the first; it has taken half a century to reach the end of the fifth—and the first section of it was published a year over a decade and a half ago. Two wars might be thought enough hindrance, but the inveterate standpat attitude of your antiquated pundit can aggravate even the obstruction to grammatical studies thrown up by the *Kriegsherren*, Hohenzollern or Hitler. Latinists and Hellenists alike at least in cisatlantic regions, when willy-nilly they must on occasion exercise themselves over a matter of grammar, are now far removed from all modern conceptions of language, and have done at least as much to cut the underpinning from beneath their own ungainly edifices

14. Polybius 2. 19. 8; cf. *RE*, III, 1213.

15. To Cic. *Verr. act.* pr. 29.

as any scientist. Apart from the handful of comparativists, it is either arid theoretical linguists or corybantic sociologists who busy themselves most today with the stuff of which literature is made.

In his syntax, Schwyzer, who died in 1943, takes a position mid-way between scholastic grammar of the traditional philologist and the more daring ventures of modern doctrinaires who in this field of investigation have not succeeded in pushing exploration as far as in phonology and morphology. As for the structuralists, Schwyzer seems hardly to be aware of the principle of syntactic oppositions in descriptive analysis, even though his work is essentially descriptive, if also incidentally comparative and systematically historical. After a short introductory section (pp. 1-17) devoted to analysis (*Bedeutung und Funktion der Wortarten und Wortformen*), comes the substantial descriptive part of the work (pp. 18-602), while synthesis (*Wortgruppen und Satzlehre*, pp. 602-98) is quite compact; and then a final part, extremely brief, devoted to "syntaktische Stilistik" (pp. 698-742). The bibliography is by no means confined to items listed (pp. xix-xxiii) additional to those already enumerated at the beginning of the first volume (pp. xxv-xlvii, with additions), but is systematically worked into the body of the work, page by page.

There is a curious story told how Goodwin's *Moods and Tenses* was introduced to Henry Jackson by a Harvard man (who afterwards came to a bad end), and by Jackson to English Grecians; no one seems to have performed the same service, or perhaps could, for the Germans, and Goodwin, everywhere else known by the familiar abbreviation *MT* finds no entry into Schwyzer's main bibliography in which he has managed to stock a good deal of useless lumber, but (so far as I can find) is mentioned only on pp. 248 and 301, only in the edition of 1889, and only in the same breath as Füsting (1850), Aken (1861), and Baumlein (1846). It is difficult to imagine just what use Schwyzer made of all the bibliographical items that he names,

and even more difficult what use he expected his readers to make; if much less difficult to imagine what use they will be likely to make of them.

But for its comprehensive sweep, minute detail, thoroughgoing accuracy, abundance of illustration, and sound learning, there can be few rivals to Schwyzer, and fewer—if any—betters in the treatment of either Greek or any other syntax in any language. This is high praise, and is meant to be. Criticism is reduced to small points. For example (p. 344, cf. 584; the reference to I 802 should read 803), Schwyzer explains *δρᾶσον* and the like in dependent relative sentences (*οἷσθ' οὖν δ δρᾶσον*) as a merely formal equivalent of the negative *μὴ δρᾶσης*, where the use of the subjunctive in the direct form makes no difficulty. But in the formula *οἷσθ...δ... (ᾶ..., ὡς...)*, certainly colloquial and usually considered interrogative, dependent imperatives are of the *δρᾶσον*-type only (*ποίησον, σύμπραξον, ποιείτε* at *Ar. Ach.* 1064 being corrupt as van Leeuwen (*ποιητέ*) and Rennie (*ποιείτω*) saw. Moreover at *Eurip. Her.* 451, *ἀλλ' οἷσθ' ὁ μοι σύμπραξον* (cf. *Frag. Hermippos ap. Ath.* 11. 476 D) the imperative is accompanied by a dative of the agent (note the sympathetic dative, or the sociative), which points to a petrified verbal adjective, the -σ- (for an older -σσ-) being assimilated to the rest of the sigmatic aorist, and being in fact regular in *σύμπραξον*. Accordingly, the 2nd. sg. aorist imperative active is originally an indeclinable (neuter) gerundive and the *οἷσθ*-formula not necessarily a question at all. This quite apart from Kretschmer's much more dubious theory of an Indo-European objective conjugation submerged in the sigmatic aorists and in other tenses (the *k*-perfect, the *γ*-perfect, and the *t*-preterite), a type of conjugation familiar in the Ugro-Finnish languages, and said to occur in Basque, Georgian, and elsewhere. Such speculations would at best get little more than the mere mention given to this one by Debrunner. Yet is striking how frequently a personal object is implicit in Greek *ἐποίησε* on vases, or in Latin *fecit*.

Terminological novelties such as "fientiv" (pp. 257, 340) in contrast to "stativ" (both are "infektiv") draw fine distinctions which are at least implicit in the meaning of the root (θάλλει is "stativ," but φύεται "fientiv"), not formal at all. "Kupitiv" (p. 322) seems quite unnecessary. These will be far less useful, or interesting, to readers not chiefly concerned with grammar, than Schwyzer's brief notes on the history and appositeness—or lack of it—of old-established, usually ancient, terms familiarity with which has blurred appreciation of their force. Thus the use of syncrétism as if it had to do with κεράννυμι arose in reference to the reconciliation of opposed Protestant factions at the time of the Reformation (p. 12, n. 1, after Wackernagel); inchoative (for inchoative); so Bloomfield constantly wrote hypo-choristic) should be given up (p. 221, n. 1) in favour of "metaptotisch" to describe γηράσκω: ἐγήραν, *senesco: consenui*. Actually -σκ- is progressive in force, not ingressive or inchoative.<sup>1</sup> Not "genus verbi" but diathesis is the better term for the contrasts some ancient *plagosus Orbilius* exemplified in τύπτω: τύπτομαι (p. 222, n. 4, Dion. Thrax 48 Uhlig; on the adoption of this verb as a paradigm Sandys has some edifying remarks in his *Select Private Orations of Demosthenes*, II, 234–39). But I miss Debrunner's own explanation of μέση, μεσότης, μέσον as an echo of Semitic usage that left the philosopher Zeno of Citium, who presumably learnt a Semitic language before he learnt Greek, at a loss when he came to fit the Greek forms into the framework of his native terminology (*IF*, XLVI [1928], 219); but perhaps the author himself no longer holds to that explanation; in fact reflexive forms are common enough, although it is not in strict accord with the methods of Semitic grammar to call the reflexive a voice.

Schwyzzer stresses the fact, often overlooked (but cf. Goodwin *MT* [1891], p. 391, n. 1, reprinted from *HSCP* I, [1890], 67, n. 1; known to Schwyzer only at second

hand) that in the idiom of οὐ μὴ with the future indicative or aorist subjunctive, good manuscripts (e.g., Rav. at *Clouds* 296, Ven. 474 at *Clouds* 367 and 505) write οὐ μὴ σκώψῃς, i.e., a prohibition preceded by the independent negative "No." But it is not made clear that Goodwin himself emphatically rejected this notion (suggested by Gildersleeve) as an explanation of the construction or even as its source.

Especially satisfactory is the recognition (p. 333) that the alternation of optative and subjunctive in final clauses as in Hdt. 1. 185 (quoted on p. 323; cf. Thuc. 2. 5.4; 6. 96. 3; but note that the reading is not always certain, e.g., Hdt. 2.161 ἀρχῇ: ἀρχοι, Thuc. 2.3.4 προσφέρουσιν: προσφέρονται, 3.22.8 ἦ: εἴη) is essentially an alternation between oblique and direct expression. Goodwin *MT*, p. 115 is more downright still in his statement of the usage.

In matters of grammar the facts are rarely in dispute; interpretation of them is far less frequently so than in literary criticism, which is apt to become a mere exchange of opinion. Schwyzer's *Greek Syntax* is a model of completeness in its collection of the facts, of judicious clarity in its concise formulation of what the facts mean, and of wise restraint in the far more difficult problems of historical development or of comparison with the idiom of other Indo-European languages. This edition is not likely to need revision before the year 2000.

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

*Harvard University*

*The Minoan-Mycenaean Religion and its Survival in Greek Religion.* By MARTIN P. NILSSON. 2d ed., rev. ("Skrifter Utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund," Vol. IX.) Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1950. Pp. xxiv + 656 + 203 figs. Kr. 50.

In the study of the religious life of prehistoric Greece there have been two works of paramount importance. Evans' essay on the Mycenaean Tree and Pillar

1. I have not blundered here. Any reader who thinks I have should think again.

Cult, though published at a time (1901) when the excavations in Crete had only just begun, revealed many of the basic features of the cult and has strongly influenced most subsequent investigation. In 1927 Nilsson produced his comprehensive study of the vastly increased body of evidence which a generation of excavating had brought to light. His sober judgment and his scrupulous adherence to the sound principle that Minoan religion must primarily be explained within its own framework won for him general recognition as the foremost authority on the subject and established his work as a classic. Now he has performed the great service of bringing this work up to date.

Despite the years of war much new evidence has been uncovered in the past quarter century and there has been much pertinent discussion of the problems of Minoan religion, including the full-length studies by Persson (1942) and Picard (1948). All of the new material has been incorporated into the present work, and as before Nilsson is careful to indicate the views of those scholars whose interpretations differ from his own, though in general he avoids polemical discussion. Some measure of the labor that has gone into the revised edition is given by the fact that it contains 75 additional pages and 95 more illustrations than its predecessor.

Yet what is perhaps its most impressive feature is how little fundamental change has been necessary. The new material takes its place unobtrusively throughout the volume, and only rarely has Nilsson been obliged to modify an essential argument or retract an opinion. This is the best possible proof of the validity of the conclusions put forth in the original edition. They have stood the test not merely of time but of abundant new evidence and full discussion.

The one major change is a greater recognition of the distinction between Mycenaean and Minoan religion, and of the continuity between Mycenaean and Homeric religion. To this end the intro-

ductory chapter has been much revised, chiefly along the lines already indicated by Nilsson in his *Homer and Mycenae* (1933). More important is the new interpretation put forward of the H. Triada sarcophagus. Nilsson now believes that this was fashioned for a Mycenaean prince by Minoan craftsmen who utilized the forms of Minoan divine cult to serve the ends of the Mycenaean cult of the Great Dead (pp. 440-42). This would account for much that is otherwise difficult to explain, but it also seems to remove the chief evidence for Minoan divinization of the dead, to which, however, Nilsson still adheres (cf. pp. 442-43, 625).

Other notable additions or changes may be listed briefly. Two appendixes are added to the Introduction, one (pp. 34-40) on mythological representations in Mycenaean art, the second (pp. 40-50) on suspect objects, the Thisbe hoard, the "Ring of Minos," and the "Ring of Nestor" (cf. also p. 313, n. 20 on ivory and stone statuettes of dubious authenticity). Two important gold rings from Thebes (cf. *Arch. Anz.* LIV [1939], 231, fig. 3) are here for the first time adequately reproduced (p. 179 and figs. 82, 83). The discussion of alleged Minoan connections with Asia Minor (pp. 222-24) is much revised. Pages 393-95 bring up to date the discussion of the hypothetical Great Minoan Goddess, perhaps the most hotly debated problem in Minoan religion, though Nilsson's view seems to the reviewer incontrovertible. Chapter XIV on the Continuity of the Cult and the Cult Places is strengthened by the addition of a considerable amount of new evidence. The Master of Animals now receives recognition as a major Minoan divinity (pp. 513-16). Finally, the closing chapter, on the Hero Cult and the After-life, contains significant new material on Mycenaean tombs and a valuable discussion (pp. 616-19) of the important paper by Mylonas in *AJA* LII (1948) 56-81.

Misprints, though fairly frequent, are rarely misleading except where a page reference from the earlier edition has been



retained unchanged (on p. 346, n. 21 for "above, p. 220" read "257"; on p. 352, n. 42, second line, for "p. 231" read "268"). A "statuette in Philadelphia" mentioned on p. 50 is not accounted for by the cross-reference (read "Baltimore" ?), and Miss Helene J. Kantor's name unfortunately appears throughout as Krantor. Although no significant omissions were noted, a fuller discussion of the "Temple Tomb" at Knossos (cf. p. 241) and of the ivory "Triad" of Mycenae (p. 313, n. 20 on p. 314 and addendum, p. xxiv), to which others have attached such importance, would have been welcome.

For an arduous and self-imposed task well done Nilsson deserves our warmest thanks. His title of *emeritus* has meant no lessening of his productive vigor and his recent works have put all students of classical antiquity more than ever in his debt. Now that his *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* is finished and in print, would it be ungracious to express the hope that he will undertake next a revision of his *Griechische Feste* ?

FRANCIS R. WALTON

University of Chicago

---

*La mantique apollinienne à Delphes: Essai sur le fonctionnement de l'Oracle.* By PIERRE AMANDRY. ("Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome," Fasc. 170.) Paris: E. de Boccard, éditeur, 1950. Pp. 291 + 6 pls.

It is surprising, in view of the fame of the Delphic oracle, how little we really know of the way in which it functioned. Perhaps its very fame has contributed to our ignorance, for to the writers of the classical period the whole procedure of consultation was so familiar that they simply take it for granted. Later, in the age of the oracle's decline, though our sources are more abundant and more specific, speculation, learned or popular, on the nature of the divine inspiration tended to overshadow and obscure all other questions, and even to color or

distort in some degree the accounts of actual practice. Our traditional picture, current since the seventeenth century, of the method by which the divine will was revealed is in all essentials derived from these late sources, in particular from a passage of Lucan and from the hostile reports of certain Christian apologists. It is the great merit of Amandry's work that this whole picture has now been subjected to a searching criticism. As a result much that we have hitherto accepted as fact must be discarded or radically modified.

We may note at the outset two commendable features of the book: a bibliography (pp. 7-13), which not only lists the work of his predecessors but summarizes their views, and an appendix (pp. 241-60) containing the relevant Greek or Latin texts. The main body of the work is divided into three sections, of which the first concerns the methods of divination employed. Since Lobeck, it has been generally admitted that the phrase ἀνείλεν ὁ Θεός implies the use of cleromancy, but at the same time most scholars relegate this use to the pre-Apollonian period. That the lot was however at least one of the regular modes of consultation is now formally attested by an inscription of the fourth century B.C., previously published by Amandry in *BCH*, LXIII (1939), pp. 183ff. Late but apparently trustworthy sources add that the lots were placed in the basin of the tripod and there shaken by the prophetess to determine the god's will. As to ecstatic revelation by an inspired prophetess, the earliest allusions are to be found in the *Phaedrus* of Plato (where μαντική is regarded as a form of divine possession, μανία), and even here nothing is said of the wild and disordered behavior of the Pythia which has so long been accepted as part of the conventional picture. Amandry rightly emphasizes the difference between the Pythia and such figures as Cassandra or the Sybils. The Pythia was, in a restricted sense, ἐνθεός, but there is nothing to indicate that she was at any time chosen on the ground of special psychic qualities; she was not a

*voyante*. Rather it was her function, primarily at least, to determine the divine decision, generally between fixed alternatives, not to predict the future. The relatively few representations of oracular consultation which can safely be referred to Delphi (chap. 6) are all most readily interpreted in terms of cleromantic rites; it is noteworthy that there is no hint of anything resembling a Dionysian frenzy in these scenes. The evidence for oneiromancy (chap. 3) and other forms of divination (chap. 5) is slight, and for the most part can be accounted for by the pretensions of Delphi and its god to be the source of all divination. There is a good, though necessarily inconclusive, discussion of the supposed Thriai in the Homeric Hymn to Hermes.

A number of diverse problems connected with the consultation of the oracle comprise the second section (chaps. 7-14): the times when the oracle was available; the offering of the *pelanos*, with a full discussion (pp. 86-103) of the religious significance of the term; the preliminary sacrifice; the personnel of the sanctuary; the role of the laurel, the sacred spring, and the tripod; and finally the formulas commonly employed in the questions and responses. This last is especially illuminating. As a rule the god was presented with a choice of alternatives, or, if the petitioner had already determined on a course of action, Apollo was asked to specify what divine or heroic aid should be invoked to further the project. The first type of question is eminently suited to determination by means of the lot, and the second is not incompatible with it; in any case the fact that the oracles were delivered orally allowed the god and his ministers a certain latitude.

It is the third and final section, "Histoire et légende" that is at once the most difficult and the most provocative. As is well known Delphi's importance declined seriously in the Hellenistic Age and even more under the Empire, yet it is precisely from this later period that the authors, from Diodorus on, emphasize ecstatic

states and direct inspiration. How far this may represent a real change in the oracular method is uncertain, but here, if at all, is the time and place to look for possible Dionysian influence, just as popular belief may now have assimilated the Pythia in some degree to the stereotype of the Sybils. Even more important, however, in determining the attitude of late antiquity was the ancient tradition of the oracle of Ge to which Apollo succeeded (a tradition not yet confirmed by archeology, the oracular nature of the Mycenaean cult at Delphi being still problematical), for from it arose the belief that the agency of the divine inspiration was a *πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ σπαστικόν* emanating from a crevice in the earth. Best seen in the transparently aetiological account of the oracle's discovery given by Diodorus (16. 26), it derives apparent confirmation from the materialist theory of inspiration enunciated by the Stoic Lamprias in Plutarch's *De defectu oraculorum*. Against this is the fact that no such crevice seems ever to have existed. Why then does Plutarch appear to countenance the idea? Amandry's solution seems to be correct: Plutarch in other treatises expressly rejects the Stoic thesis, and proposes other, quite different theories of inspiration in which the crevice plays no part; his concern, evidently, was not with the actuality but with philosophic theories. That popular belief from late Hellenistic times on accepted the crevice and its fumes is of course a different matter.

Amandry repeatedly admits that the results of his investigation are in large part negative, and that, pending fresh discoveries, many details of the functioning of the oracle must remain uncertain. With all due reserve and modesty he proposes in his concluding chapter a tentative reconciliation of the ascertainable facts and of the tradition. The Pythia was "inspired," in the sense that, purified by the laurel of Apollo, by the waters of the sacred spring, and by her obligation of chastity, she was in a "state of grace," which enabled her to become a suitable

vehicle for the divine revelation; but neither the device for producing artificial emanations proposed by Holland nor Nilsson's suggestion of self-hypnosis is required. The primary function of the tripod was to contain the lots; the fact that the god "spoke" from the tripod could easily suggest its use as a seat for the Pythia while she delivered the oracles. Her alleged frenzy is merely a late elaboration of the Platonic *μανία*, but it combined with the Aristotelian and Stoic doctrine of terrestrial emanations to create the image of the oracular process which has ever since prevailed.

There are a number of points on which one might willingly and perhaps profitably take issue with the author. His emphasis on the chthonic nature of the ritual should not lead us to disregard the fact that to the classical Greeks Apollo was an Olympian of the Olympians, and in any case too sharp a distinction between the terms chthonic and Olympian is apt to introduce into Greek religion a clarity of outline that it did not always possess. Again, his interpretation of literary passages seems at times oversubtle. Does, for example, Plato in *Phaedrus* 244 A-B (cf. pp. 49-50) really imply that the prophetesses of Delphi and Dodona engaged either in two kinds or in two qualities of divination? Is he not simply contrasting their services as "inspired" agents of divinity with their personal unimportance? These criticisms, however, scarcely affect the main argument of the work, and this appears essentially sound, highly stimulating, and of the first importance.

FRANCIS R. WALTON

University of Chicago

*Apollo Delphinios*. By PHOTÉINE P. BOURBOULIS. (*Laographia*, Suppl. 5.) Thessalonike, Greece, 1949. Pp. 83.

Briefly stated, it is the author's thesis that Apollo Delphinios is an Ionian creation, that the myth associating him with Theseus is older than the "Cretan" myth

of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo, that the maritime character of the god first arose during the Ionian migrations to Asia Minor by an extension of his functions as "Averter of Evil," and that the identification of the dolphin with the god depends not on the mere fact that dolphins commonly accompany ships but that they were regarded as animal-guides, divinely leading the colonists to the destined spot for settlement. The maritime Apollo was then accepted by the Dorians (and so carried, e.g., to Crete), and his cult was further spread from Ionia by the colonization of the Archaic period. Finally, the festivals of the god at Athens and Aegina are associated with the opening of navigation in the spring.

Parts of this thesis are not unattractive, especially the explanation of the dolphin as a supernatural animal-guide, for which there are numerous parallels. Again, granted that our sources are insufficient for any final judgments, the interpretation of the festivals is also plausible. In the dating of the myths, however, the argument is often halting and unconvincing, and the evidence hardly warrants such definite conclusions.

There is a useful listing (pp. 10-18) of sources, both literary and epigraphical, with the relevant passages given in full. Unfortunately it is not complete. We may add the mention of a temple at Hyrtakos in Crete (*SEG*, IV, 599), of a priesthood at Nisyros (*Eph. Arch.* [1913], p. 8) and of a theophoric name at Gorgippia in South Russia (Latyshev, *Insc. Ponti Euxini*, IV, 432 B II. 7).

FRANCIS R. WALTON

University of Chicago

*Storia della letteratura latina*. By ETTORÉ PARATORE. Firenze: Sansoni, 1950. Pp. 991. L. 1400.

The present history of Latin literature is just that, rather than a handbook of factual and bibliographical data. In almost a thousand pages there are only a handful

of footnotes, no learned references, nothing of a polemical nature. Instead of the traditional rubrics (archaic, golden, silver, etc.) the account is separated into nine divisions: (1) the origins (pp. 1-13), (2) from the Tarentine war to the conflict with the East (pp. 15-84), (3) the following period to the death of Sulla (pp. 85-157), (4) the age of Caesar (pp. 159-333), (5) that of Augustus (pp. 335-519), (6) the Julio-Claudian dynasty (pp. 521-647), (7) the Flavians and Trajan (pp. 649-756), (8) the Antonines (pp. 757-97), and (9) the late Empire (pp. 799-984). These divisions, which correspond to distinct periods of Roman political history, bring into relief the intimate connection between the political and cultural (and specifically literary) history of Rome, which is stressed at the outset (p. 2) and which constitutes one of the basic principles of the book.

Each division is introduced by a chapter setting forth the climate, literary and political, of the period in question, and the part played by contemporary writers in determining and in reflecting it. More important authors are discussed in separate chapters, in some instances of considerable length (Cicero 62 pp., Virgil 44, Petronius 30, St. Augustine 22); lesser figures are grouped in chapters usually at the end of the divisions. The *History* is illuminated throughout by a critical approach at once balanced and independent, immense familiarity with the Latin writers, and a perspicacious understanding of literary and human values.

Apropos of the time-honored separation of Roman culture into pre- and post-Hellenic phases, the second beginning in the latter half of the third century B.C. and attaining considerable development before the end of the Hannibalic war, it is maintained that much of the legendary material having to do with the founding and early days of Rome is of indigenous rather than Greek origin; that Rome had by no means been exempt from Greek influence in the so-called pre-Hellenic phase, so that there was some justification for Aristotle's statement that Rome was a Greek city; finally,

that in the second part of the third century the influence of Greek letters remained relatively limited, not at all comparable in extent or importance to that exercised in the following century through members of the Scipionic circle.

In the chapter on Plautus it is observed that his popularity among scholars is to be explained on philological rather than aesthetic grounds; should it be established that Plautus was a technically incompetent piecer-together of Greek comic themes, his essential greatness would not be in the least diminished, for "what grips every reader of Plautus by the throat... is the overflowing liveliness which permeates every scene from beginning to end, which, save for Aristophanes, is without parallel in world literature" (p. 44). Yet his cynicism ("homo homini lupus") and lack of moral sensitivity deny him universality; Ballio of the *Pseudolus* is his only immortal creation, and "in intuitive understanding of the lowest and most trivial human beings, Petronius is much deeper than Plautus" (p. 57).

The second period of Greek influence, that associated with Panaetius and Polybius and the younger Scipio, had far-reaching consequences. The fusion brought about at this time between Greek thought and Roman political tradition formed the background for the characteristically Roman concept of *humanitas*. This not only recognized the paramount value of the individual human being and the moral obligations with which he is invested, but, with the introduction of subjective lyric poetry by Q. Lutatius Catulus and his fellow poets at the end of the second century, went on to reveal him as a creature of passion and of suffering (p. 96).

The comprehensive chapter on Cicero is the kernel of the book. Done with admirable skill, it makes clear the tremendous significance of Cicero's achievement. The influence of Cicero's verse, paralleling on a much smaller scale that of his prose (as a model to those whose delicacy of taste outweighed their originality) is not overlooked (pp. 175-76); his role as forerunner

of Augustan civilization in its fundamental aspects is well discussed (p. 214); the cliché of his "eclecticism" is exploded; in fact he strongly favored Stoicism and the doctrine of the later Academy (since Posidonius and Antiochus of Ascalon the two schools had become interpenetrated), whereas unlike Seneca he did not show the least eclectic tendency toward Epicureanism, but remained consistently hostile to it (p. 221). His frequent shifts of political position are explained by his hatred of extremes, of bloodshed, of excessively obvious injustices; "if his political faith appears to change, his fidelity to the most obvious moral values of social existence remains constant, and it is precisely these values that are most apt to be forgotten in periods of radical upheaval" (p. 180). After noting that the conclusion of the *Tusculans* is that one should not put undue faith in abstract reason, but rather to rely on an "impassioned ethical sense" (*appassionata eticità*), the author remarks that it was in Cicero that the spiritual disquiet that was to produce rich artistic fruits in the *Aeneid* and reach a critical stage in Seneca before being assuaged by the Christian faith first manifested itself at Rome; it was not for nothing that Cicero's philosophical works were deeply appreciated in the Middle Ages (p. 225).

Of the chapters on the Augustans, that on Virgil is the most sympathetic, the one dealing with Ovid the least. Credit is given to the psychological finesse of the latter poet in the *Heroides*, but the *Metamorphoses* are dismissed as superficially picturesque and lacking in constructional integrity, and the author has little good to say of the *Fasti* and the poems from exile; of the latter he uncharitably observes that their defects cannot be blamed on the poet's sufferings since (a) in great poets suffering customarily results in the highest poetry and (b) Ovid had already started on the downward path before misfortune came upon him (p. 499). With regard to Virgil, the *Eclogues* are "the most authentic Virgil, where the spring of his inspiration gushes forth with the most continuous and un-

broken freshness" (p. 375); the *Georgics*, for all the "haud mollia iussa," could never have been written save by spontaneous inspiration; at most Maecenas, perceiving that the work was in harmony with Octavian's moral and political program, encouraged and supported the poet (p. 376).

After reviewing the question of the identity of the Vergilius mentioned in Horace *Carm.* 4. 12 (the *studium lucri* of the Horatian figure has been thought to allude to Virgil, whose great wealth is attested by Donatus),<sup>1</sup> the author points to the parallel between Virgil and his fellow North Italian Manzoni with respect to certain inconsistencies between their private and artistic personalities, and warns us that "judgment on the art of each should be kept apart from considerations on their empiric personalities; the ideal figure that is implicit in their works will always be more valid and more enduring than that which biographical details may suggest" (p. 387).

Horace and Livy are well handled; of the historian it is acutely remarked that despite his reputation as artist *par excellence*, his work contains more grey, arid stretches than that of any other Latin historian. Many readers who form their judgments at first hand will agree. However, the reason given, viz., that this dullness is a result of the great extent of Livy's work, is questionable, for it is probable that the series of lost books in which the last hundred years of the Republic were recounted were among the most highly colored and dramatic of the entire history.

In the section dealing with the Julio-Claudian dynasty the chapters on Seneca and Petronius deserve especial mention; that on Lucan (who is appropriately compared to Goya) contains good observations

1. This is one of the very many instances where the points at issue in philological problems are summarized and current views pro and con set forth and evaluated; another example is the paragraph (p. 378) demolishing a recent attempt to interpret the first book of the *Georgics* in terms of Pythagorean numerology; see also the incisive pages (819-26) which survey the question of the priority of the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix vs. Tertullian's *Apologeticus* and advance telling arguments for the priority of the former.



on his method and style, e.g., the Ovidian origin of his concern with purely visual values (pp. 602-3); in the final three sections the chapter on Juvenal and that on St. Augustine stand out particularly; in the latter, apropos of the *De civitate Dei*, we are well reminded of the timeliness of St. Augustine's assertion of the superiority of absolute moral values over contingent political ones in an age so prone to pathological worship of the state as is our own (p. 942).

This *History* is a notable book. Perhaps the greatest of its many merits is the demonstration it provides of the enduring vitality of Roman *humanitas* as manifested in Latin literature.<sup>2</sup>

RICHARD T. BRUÈRE

University of Chicago

*Cultura greca e unità macedone nella politica di Filippo II.* By FRANCO CARRATA. ("Università di Torino, Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di lettere e filosofia," Vol. I, Fasc. 3.) Torino, 1949. Pp. 45.

In this brief study Professor Carrata assesses the significance of the career of Philip II in Greek history. There is copious reference, at least by citation of titles, to the scholarly work of recent years on the historiography of the fourth century, on the career of Philip and on the Hellenic League, but its significance seems to have escaped the author in many respects. To him Philip is a barbarian, attracted by the rich spiritual life of Greece, but failing to understand that its source was in the free life of the city state (pp. 16ff.). This quality was lacking in Macedonia; to remedy that deficiency Philip desired to absorb the Greek world—to create a great political organism, spiritually and materi-

ally strong. The Hellenic League which was designed to effect this union between Macedonia and Greece was a failure, destructive of that very Greek spirituality which Philip desired. With this view of the significance of Philip's work it is not surprising that we learn in the concluding section that Alexander's work had no element of universality and that the Hellenistic Age was essentially noncreative. We are finally informed (p. 45) that "the only positive value which illumines and transfigures Hellenism is in the luminous civilization of Rome together with the fervid message of Christ."

It might be argued that Macedonia's consolidation as a northern power or that the aim of a Persian conquest should be given equal importance in an assessment of Philip with his concern to absorb Greece. Carrata, however, has concentrated on the latter, but in a manner which will scarcely win support. Surely the work of the last generation on the fourth century has shown that the Greeks themselves were attempting to turn from the particularism of the city state; the attempts to establish a common peace, the attempted utilization of the symmarchy to that end, the experiments with federal organization, the appearance in fact and in theory of the "monarch" are indicative of impulses towards new political creation. In the Hellenic League Philip attempted to give them expression and, at the same time, make allowance for the still strong feeling of particularism. Professor Carrata sets all this aside with his basic assumption that the politically creative energy of Greece still lay wholly in the city state. There is no attempt to come to grips with the fundamentals of the problem posited by the League: the relation between syndrion and constituent members, between syndrion and hegemon; and no explanation of why Macedonia was not a member of the League if Philip was attempting to absorb the spiritual values of Greece for his country.

While some of Professor Carrata's criticism of his predecessors is pertinent (cf.

2. There are a certain number of slips and misprints, most of which have been already discovered. A list of some sixty has been sent this journal by the publishers, with the assurance that they will be corrected in the forthcoming edition *de luxe*. The following additional points have been noticed: "*Sciah*" is a word of Indo-Iranian origin, and is not connected with "Caesar" (p. 264); for (Catullus) 103 read 93 (p. 303); finally Canopus was not on the island of Pharos (p. 735 n. 1).

the remarks on Philip's deification, pp. 27-32) their views are scarcely to be set aside by a few sentences leaving fundamental problems unattacked—problems which must be reworked to support such a hypothesis as that of the author.

CARL ROEBUCK

*University of Chicago*

*The Lost Province or The Worth of Britain.*

By M. P. CHARLESWORTH. ("Gregynog Lectures," 1948.) Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1949. Pp. viii + 89 + 2 maps. 8s. 6d.

"I have tried to set out why the Romans first conquered and afterwards remained in this island; then in what ways its occupation proved useful and profitable to them; finally, what they have bequeathed to us." Mr. Charlesworth thus describes his aim in the preface to the small book in which his lectures, delivered at the University of Wales in 1948, are printed. The aims are admirably achieved. After a clear and able sketch of the conquest and occupation of Britain, the main question of why Rome chose to hold the island, when other frontier territory, Dacia and the areas beyond the Rhine, were sacrificed, is discussed. Before the middle of the second century the island was apparently an economic liability, the worth of which raised some doubts in semi-official circles, probably represented by Appian's remarks (*Praef.* 5). Political reasons, the effect of a free Britain on Gaul, and strategic considerations, Britain as one shore of an "Atlantic Lake," had their effect in outweighing the expenses of occupation. Charlesworth points in particular, however, to Britain's value as a source of man power for the army, as a defense-reserve, and as an admirable training ground for recruits. These last considerations continued to be a factor until the necessities of defense elsewhere in the Empire resulted in the withdrawal of the troops, but after the middle of the second century the economic development of Britain's mineral wealth,

agricultural production, particularly of grain, and industry presumably changed the loss to a profit in Roman accounts. Mr. Charlesworth sketches the permanent effects of the occupation in his final lecture, emphasizing the importation of species of fruit trees, flowers, and vegetables, many of which he ascribes to a Roman rather than a medieval date.

The book is attractively printed on good paper and has two useful maps; one is of Roman Wales and the other of the Saxon shore defenses on the Channel, possibly planned originally by Carausius and perfected by Constantius. There are brief notes and a bibliography.

CARL ROEBUCK

*University of Chicago*

*De quibusdam Plauti exemplaribus Graecis: Philemon—Plautus.* By BARBARA KRY-SINIEL-JOZEFOWICZ. ("Torun Society of Sciences, Philological-philosophical Section," Vol. II, No. 2.) Torun, 1949. Pp. 109.

The author's approach to this familiar problem stems from Plautine excellence in *sermonibus* (Varro *Ex Nonio* 374.6), in which she believes Plautine *color* will be found. This resolves itself into an assumption that Greek *sermones* reflected total consistency of character and on this she evaluates the Plautine plays (pp. 8-9). *Color* of Plautus is revealed by that which contradicts the *mores naturamque personarum agentium*, the *leges psychologicas*, or the oft-cited *rationem fabulae*. To identify these she appeals constantly to the Greek *lex dramatica*, asserts that *nemo negabit* that such and such would not obtain in Philemon, and shudders at how *plane abhorret ab usu Graeco* some "obvious" Plautine addition. This approach is not new; it savors of the familiar, but unquoted, Langen collections of inconsistencies and the frequently cited Leo. One has the uncomfortable feeling that Mme K.-J. might have revised her opinion of the perfection of Greek Comedy had she not apparently

ignored the work of such men as Prescott, Wheeler, Beare, Duckworth, Harsh, and the reviewer. If these strictures seem harsh, and if some allowances must be made for the tribulations of Polish scholarship even in the 30's (for this work, though completed in 1939, was not published until 1949 because of *tempora adversa*), honesty compels a protest against the continental tendency to ignore British-American scholarship without even the lip-service of refutation. A careful reading leaves the unmistakable impression that Plautine scholarship is just where Leo and Fraenkel left it a generation ago, and that in her efforts to separate the *ridicula* of Plautus from the *res severas* of the Greek Mme K.-J. has but perpetuated the senseless bludgeoning of Plautus initiated by Jachmann's utter inability to recognize a joke or to understand the *vis comica*. Two simple examples will illustrate what the reader will find on almost every page: the great number of orders given at *Trin.* 577 are used as evidence that certain scenes must have been omitted by Plautus, but Mme K.-J. does not even mention the humorous effect of the *i modo*'s; she sees no humor in the Lysimachus-Pasicompsa scene (*Merc.* 3.1) and entirely misses the point of the delaying tactics (566). It should, unfortunately, be pointed out that to assume *Most.* 905 means the house is "not good" so that it may contradict 907 (p. 107) is sheer mis-translation. The evidences for omitted Greek scenes are the usual arguments (all treated as though they were new): characters with small parts who "clearly" did more in the Greek (e.g., Thesprio, but she leaves Grumio alone), duplication of action (Plautus doubled something because it would delight the audience), off-stage action (as though there could be no such thing in Greek), suggested action not carried out (e.g., deception of Pseudolus by Simo at *Pseud.* 1019 is demanded by the *lex artis dramaticae Graecae!*), two major events in one scene (because they "must" have been separated in the original, e.g., purchase and recognition in *Epid.* 5.1 [p. 60]). Each Plautine scholar will make

his own list of complaints which will only confirm the impression that the author's plausible sounding arguments depend more upon intuition than upon evidence, and that subjectivity of interpretation in Europe is in need of such a check-rein as that administered here by Harsh (*AJP*, LVIII [1937], 282-95) two years before Mme K.-J. wrote. Perhaps the most difficult pill for Americans to swallow is the bland remark (p. 7) "*sed antequam ad restituendum uniuscuiusque fabulae exemplar accedimus, liceat nobis quasi uno aspectu omnes comoedias poetae Romani complecti*"—as if Prescott had not pointed out thirty years ago that this was the only proper approach (*CP*, XIV [1919], 135).

Plautine scholars will wish to study Mme K.-J.'s reconstructions of Philemon and evaluate each on its merits. In general she believes that Plautus omitted many scenes from the Greek in order to make room for his *ridicula* and expanded some Greek material which he deemed suitable. This resulted in rearrangement of scenes and compression of characters. *Mercator*: Acanthio's greater Greek role is largely transferred to Eutychus. The dream was Lysimachus', not Demipho's. The girl entered the houses of both *senes*. Demipho's wife, not Lysimachus', appealed to her father, who, rather than Eutychus, reprimanded Demipho (5.4, because for Eutychus to do so "a more comoediae Graecae abhorreret videtur," p. 37). In this play Mme K.-J. illustrates most completely how literally she takes every word: p. 27 on moral principles, p. 29 on the Lysimachus-Pasicompsa scene (see above), and *passim* in which every word of the dream must come literally true (though she does not even mention the same dream in the *Rudens* or what bearing its presence there might have on her interpretation). Line 1007 (*brevis fabula erit*) clinches the argument that Demipho's wife had a part (to me it is merely funny), and Dorippa should have more reason to return to the city, i.e., to suspect Lysimachus, than her *ingenium* because line 677 conflicts with 277. Line 803 shows that the *pater* scene was omitted.

She even finds evidence of conversations between Acanthio and Syra (ll. 670, 805; cf. Phil. Frag. 125 [p. 39]). Finally, if Plautus breaks "psychological laws" in returning to *res serias* after his insertion of the exile *ioci* (p. 40), she might have cited as the reason Frank's well-known interpretation of the exile scenes (*AJP*, LIII [1932], 243-48).

*Epidicus*, which she claims for Philemon because *Epidicus* = *epidikazomenos* = *epidikasian* of the *Phormio* (perhaps her most convincing conjecture), saw the *fidicina* (who *was* the daughter) married to Stratippocles *à la* Phormio; Chaeribulus married the captive. There was more about the *miles* and Periphanes, not Stratippocles, was the one who returned from the wars. If Mme K.-J. could not have read Keyes on the half-sister (*TAPA*, LXXI [1940]), she would at least have done well to read Wheeler (*AJP*, XXXVIII [1917], 237-64) before claiming credit for reviving Dziatzko's theory to the detriment of Kuiper.

*Pseudolus* is claimed for Philemon on the basis of two (unconvincing) fragments which suggest *Sardios* as the title and name of Harpax. Proof of the shortening of the play rests on the usual arguments: Callipho must have had a larger role because he promises help, but in 1.5 he couldn't have promised aid in Simo's presence ("ab usu fabulae Graecae plane abhorret," [p. 78]). Various other details, especially the much-discussed *sponsio*, are exasperating to read, tedious to record, and important only to the Plautine specialist who must decide for himself whether Mme K.-J.'s imagination (like Dorippa's *ingenium*) is a surer guide to Philemon than is Plautus.

*Trinummus* had more about the treasure because it is in the title. Various scenes are suggested by the alleged discrepancies: 3.2 must have preceded 2.2 so that Lysiteles' conversation with Lesbonicus (the real scoundrel) may be what Philto objects to (this is "shown" by 282, where Lysiteles is a scoundrel, conflicting with 272, where he is virtuous as a result of Philto's reprimands). Stasimus was a good slave

looking after Charmides' interests; Plautus made him a rascal. The *ager-dowry* motif was differently handled, the *senes'* relationship more fully dealt with, and both youths' wives introduced. Such changes are based on inconsistencies concerning the receipt of the house-money (ll. 125, 402), literal interpretations of Philto's complaints (pp. 86, 88-89) and other dubious arguments.

*Mostellaria* has been changed, as proved by the double occurrence of the house building motif (ll. 101, 760), of which one must be a Plautine expansion (101 is the victim: "cum versus 760 sq. cum fabula ita cohaereant, ut amoveri ab ea non possint, aliter iudicandum est de versibus 101 sq. . . etc. etc." [p. 102]). The scare-Theopropides-away-from-the-house motif, which Plautus inserted and hence had to foreshadow (p. 103) does not fit with the cautious character of the *senex*. Perhaps Mme K.-J. would be less suspicious of foreshadowing had she read Harsh on *Dramatic Preparation* (Chicago, 1935, pp. 69-70).

Several numerals in line references are garbled: p. 56 for 316 read 361, p. 60 for 653 read 635, p. 87 for 227 read 277.

Two separate papers, published in 1938 but only just received, were included in the material for review: *Die Technik des Plautinischen Miles Gloriosus* ("Society of Friends of Science," Vol. IX, No. 4 [Wilno, 1938], pp. 41) and *De Plauti Aulularia eiusque exemplari Graeco* ("Comptes rendus des séances de la Société des sciences et des lettres de Varsovie," Vol. XXXI, Classe I [Warsaw, 1938], 7-18). Both papers show the pattern of interpretation already well developed. The first, in which one notes with relief Duckworth's article (*CP*, XXX [1935], 228-46) cited, maintains that the *Miles Gloriosus* is altered from an original unified plot featuring both the hole-in-the-wall and the twin-sister tricks. In the *Aulularia* Euclio found the treasure only when, at the marriage sacrifice of his daughter to Megadorus (by whom she is accepted without dowry to save her honor), the Lar discloses it so that she may marry

Lycónides properly. Plautine changes have left Euclio's character inconsistent in his frantic guarding of the treasure while simultaneously letting cooks, etc. into the house; discovery of the treasure during the play would relieve all difficulties. The author's general attitude toward Plautus, which underlies both this and the later work, is well illustrated by her assumption (p. 9) that any lack of motivation must be Plautine not Greek (contrast Harsh, *AJP*, LVIII [1937], 293) and by so typical an argument as (p. 8): "Nam nullo modo concedi potest, iam exemplar Graecum tam imperfectum fuisse, ut tot obscuritates ineptiasque, quot in fabulis inveniamus, continuerit." Perhaps it is some small measure of ironic justice that this review appears in a journal so closely associated with the name of Henry Washington Prescott, who exploded such notions thirty years ago.

JOHN N. HOUGH

University of Colorado

*Die Schule des Aristoteles: Texte und Kommentar*, Heft V: *Straton von Lampsakos*. Edited by FRITZ WEHRLI. Basel: Benno Schwabe, 1950. Pp. 83. Fr. 11.

Following the plan of the earlier fascicles, this edition of Strato contains 150 fragments (pp. 9-40) and a bibliography and commentary (pp. 41-83). The Greek and Latin texts of the fragments are, as before, supplied with critical notes, taken from standard editions. There is some additional material, especially in the notes to Diogenes Laertius, but the editor has made no new conjectures.

The text and critical notes might be improved at the following points (references are to page and line): At 14.24, the note to ελναι refers to the first occurrence of this word in the line. At 15.14 Wehrli reads ποιει in place of ποιειται in Brandis' text, apparently without reason. At 16.27, for *Cicero De deorum natura* read *Cicero De natura deorum*. In the notes to 17.7 and 34.21, Bernardakis' symbols R and M do not refer to manuscripts, but to emenders

(Reiske and Meziriac). At 18.8, in the citation of Sextus, for III 33 read III 32; and at 35.1, for II 12 read II 11. In the notes to 25.24 and 25.29 for *omiserunt* read *omiserunt*. At 26.11 πολλόν is apparently a slip, though it is intended as a correction of an error in Diels. At 28.7 the readings ἐπι . . . εἰς are departures from Schmidt's text of Hero, where the readings are ἐτι . . . ἐπι. There is no critical note, and Schmidt's text is clearly the better. Fragment 111 (33.29) should be identified by reference to Volume VII, page 3, line 21 of Bernardakis' edition, rather than to p. 697b of the fifth volume of Wyttenbach.

The largest number of fragments (41 of 150) are from Book 5 of Diogenes Laertius; the largest amount of text (over 8 pages) is from the late commentators on Plato and Aristotle, especially Simplicius and Olympiodorus. Plutarch, Sextus Empiricus, and the Doxographers also make important contributions. From Hero's *Pneumatica* Wehrli has taken seven passages, six of which contain no explicit reference to Strato. These six might better have been labeled *zweifelhaft* or *unsicher*, as their ascription to Strato (made first by Diels) has been seriously challenged. In this connection Wehrli might well have mentioned A. Schmekel, *Die positive Philosophie*, I (Berlin, 1938), 113-116, where the problem is discussed at some length.

The commentary on the various fragments indicates the main lines along which Wehrli interprets Strato's philosophy. It is eclectic in character, he says (p. 56): "atomistisches und aristotelisches Gut findet sich zu keiner ganz überzeugenden Einheit zusammen". Elsewhere Wehrli finds in Strato tendencies toward positivism (pp. 71, 81), sensualism (74), and empiricism (79). It is unfortunate that the evidence is not sufficient to permit a clear reconstruction of Strato's thought. His radical departures from the teaching of Aristotle are of major importance for the history of the Peripatetic school.

PHILLIP DE LACY

Washington University



*Nerone e i suoi tempi.* By MARIO ATTILIO LEVI. ("Biblioteca storica universitaria," Ser. II, Vol. I.) Milano: Istituto editoriale cisalpino, 1949. Pp. 234. L. 1000.

The deservedly high reputation of its author should ensure the wide circulation of this book among all students of the principate: and their perusal of it will be rewarding. For all will find something here to stimulate and profit them, not indeed in the factual sphere (since it is hardly likely that many new facts about Nero can emerge at this late date), but in the point of view and in the way that the events of the reign are marshalled, organized and interpreted. Levi is too sound a historian to embark on a crude attempt at mere whitewashing in the manner that seems to have become so fashionable for the Early Empire in recent years: he has no illusions about Nero's character. But he does seek to offer an explanation of why the events of his reign took the course they did, and it is this that makes his book so interesting. Briefly Levi's view is this: Nero's accession coincided with the climax of a cultural struggle, Hellenistic influences versus genuine Roman traditions, which had been going on from the days of the late Republic and which during the reigns of Caligula and Claudius appeared to be moving steadily in favour of the oriental elements. In Nero the romanizing party had high, and at first seemingly justified, hopes of finding another Augustus (the significance of Nero's Augustan blood does not escape Levi). But these hopes were rudely shattered in 58 when Nero failed to win senatorial co-operation for his proposal to abolish all indirect taxes. Nero at once abruptly departed from Julio-Claudian traditions and showed himself a true descendant of the Domitii Ahenobarbi. The measures and policies, which resulted from his now wilfully personal rule, met with varying success but on the whole by 64 his prestige seemed pretty firmly established. In that year, however, occurred the disaster of the great fire in Rome, and Nero never really succeeded

in overcoming the ensuing storm of unpopularity; consequently his reign moved inevitably on to its melancholy conclusion.

A bald summary such as this unfortunately gives no idea of the wealth of learning and the acuteness of observation with which Levi everywhere supports his thesis; but readers are bound to be impressed, e. g., by the freshness of his account of the literature of the Neronian age, or by his reconstruction of the campaigns of Corbulo, or by his appendix on religious conditions at that time. True, the book has some shortcomings: the description of events in Britain is pretty sketchy; the remarks on imperial finances and on *auctoritas* would carry more weight if Levi had availed himself of Sutherland's *American Journal of Philology* articles and of Grant's *From Imperium to Auctoritas*, which, even though recent publications, were in circulation at the time of his book's composition; some of his confident assertions (e. g., concerning the death of Claudius on p. 151) ought perhaps to be expressed much less dogmatically; the lack of maps and genealogical charts seriously handicaps the reader; and misprints unfortunately are not few or confined to non-Italian words. But, of course, any book can have cavils raised against it on the score of comparatively minor matters. The really important thing is whether the book can be accepted as authoritative in its main outlines; and this is something that every student of the period will have to decide for himself. The present reviewer finds Levi's methods of reasoning at more than one point somewhat inconsequential: e. g., his view is that Nero could not simply ignore the senate when it proved reluctant to approve his taxation proposal in 58 since that would have run counter to his "Augustan" program (p. 144); yet, on receiving this check by the senate, Nero proceeded at once to jettison Augustan principles entirely. Would an emperor who was prepared to murder his own Augustan mother early in 59 have tamely allowed himself to be balked by a handful of senators in 58? Then again, in his ac-

count of the sources for Nero's reign, Levi insists on the quite marked discrepancies between Tacitus, Suetonius and Dio; yet, somewhat perversely, he concludes by suggesting that all three of them might have a common origin (p. 40). Other students of Nero's reign may share the present writer's doubts on these and similar points; but, whether they do or not, it is abundantly clear that they will neglect Levi's book only to their own definite detriment.

E. T. SALMON

McMaster University,  
Hamilton, Ontario

*De Rheseo tragoedia.* By CORNELIS BAREND SNELLER. (Dissertation, Utrecht, 1949). Amsterdam: H.J. Paris, 1949. Pp. viii + 119.

Written in very readable Latin, this doctoral dissertation might well serve as a model of what a dissertation ought to be. The author has obviously mastered the literature of his subject; he deals with it firmly and sensibly, without heat but also without any undue respect for the very eminent authors of very foolish theories, indeed with a quiet irony that is very rewarding to the reader.

First we find an impressive bibliography on *Rhesus*, from 1600 on, though mostly since 1800, which is useful and seems complete. A brief introduction then presents the most important, contradictory but equally eminent, theories. The main views are, of course, either that *Rhesus* is not by Euripides and probably dates from the fourth century, or that it is by Euripides as a young man.

The arguments from structure and dramatic feeling are then dealt with in the course of a brief summary of the play; certain weaknesses are admitted, but not as being non-Euripidean, any more than the fact that "vim fabulae nostrae propriam in rapida ac 'motoria' actione esse positam." The absence of a "prologue" and the traces of two in our authorities,

are sensibly discussed. More interesting perhaps is the metrical question. Here Mr. Sneller bases his argument on previous studies of the frequency of resolved syllables, of dactyls in the third foot, of two tribrachs in the same lines, and the like. While he recognizes that the value of these arguments is largely cumulative, he believes them to be strong enough for us to date the play, if written by Euripides, not as an early tragedy, but as produced after *Hippolytus*.

After dealing with a number of other arguments for an earlier date, each of which he manages to demolish in itself, though the cumulative effect is not quite destroyed, the author passes on to the linguistic arguments, and here his conclusion is, I believe, quite established: "nil ergo lucubratio nostra attulit quod fulcrum satis solidum praebeat iis qui ob res linguisticas Rhesum ab Euripide abiudicent." The ancient authorities are then reviewed and it is shown that, on any reasonable interpretation, the genuineness, not only of a *Rhesus* but of *this Rhesus* has all the evidence in its favour and can probably be traced back to Aristotle himself. Indeed the very full review of the evidence on this and other points might well serve as a warning of the fantastic improbabilities which even the greatest scholars will not infrequently produce in all seriousness.

Mr. Sneller then proceeds in his last chapter to strengthen the conclusion arrived at in the metrical discussion (that *Rhesus* should be dated "haud multo post Hippolytum") by connecting the references to Thrace in the play with contemporary events, namely with the career of Sitalees. He does this so precisely that he feels sure the play can be dated between 427 and 424. Now if I do not find this very convincing, it is because, though I admit that contemporary events inevitably influenced the feelings of the tragedians (and, in this play, quite possibly, the attitude to Thrace), I cannot feel that such exact correspondence between historical events and the dramas is either probable or necessary. There is the further danger that the search

for contemporary references will blind us to tragic significance, for example, of Hector's attitude to Rhesus (see p. 105). It must be admitted, however, that those who accept the method will find the argument free from all inherent improbabilities.

Students of Euripides will in any case be grateful for this highly competent, readable and very useful review of the problems of Euripides' *Rhesus*.

G. M. A. GRUBE

Trinity College,  
University of Toronto

*Catulli Veronensis liber*. Recensuit Mauritijs Schuster. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1949. Pp. xiv + 153. \$ 2.25.

This book contains much well-arranged, useful material: besides *Praefatio*, *Apparatus* and *Index nominum*, an *Appendicula Graeca*, *Index metricus*, *Index uerborum et locutionum* and, appended to each poem, enough notes to provide the basis for a commentary. Like most modern editors Schuster builds his text chiefly on O and G; Hale's R he reduces to r. The readings of R (or r) should be corrected at 47.4, 97.8 and 102.1 after Hale's report in *CR*, XX (1906), 160. Again, to judge from Hale's list in *CP*, III (1908), 233-43, Schuster's statement on p. vi about the *deteriores* is erroneous.

The criticism of Catullus has now reached a point where sobriety rather than novelty is expected of an editor. Perhaps a novelty of this edition is that eighteen instances of hiatus occur in the text. So fond of hiatus is Schuster that he not only rejects several facile corrections, as at 66.48, 67.44, 99.8, but at 57.7 sets aside an approved reading of O, altogether the best MS of Catullus, to preserve the hiatus. Schuster concerns himself a good deal with orthography, but seems uncritical; for the chief MSS of Catullus are too late to be authoritative and should not be followed even in matters of aspiration, where the medieval scribes were wilder than Arrius. For example, *Arpocratem* at

74.4 and 102.4 is wrong on two counts, not to mention the monstrosity at 66.54. And we should not now be reading *Gnidumque* at 36.13 or *Gnosia* at 64.172 after Housman's "Prosody and Method II," *CQ*, XXII (1928), 1-10. To write *sei* because of a variant *sed* and *uoster* wherever the MSS offer a variant *noster* is merely trivial; such variants originated in the ordinary confusion of medieval abbreviations and tell nothing about the ancient spellings.

*Miscellanea critica*. 6.12:—Scaliger should be mentioned, and *uales* belongs to Schwabe. 10.9-10:—The conjectures of Westphal and Muretus might be noticed, at least to indicate that other scholars have had some trouble with these lines. 29.20:—The spondee is scarcely defended by the proper name in line 3. 31.5:—The correction was first made by Schwabe. 34.6:—Read *Iouis*. 51:—Add R. Lattimore, *CP*, XXXIX (1944), 184-87. 56.5-7:—Schuster seems to be unaware of Housman's note in *Hermes*, LXVI (1931), 402, which incidentally obviates Schwabe's *in puella*. 57.9:—Schuster prints the inverted *et*, but does not mention the most famous criticism of this passage. 61.206:—Heinsius is credited with the initial correction here, but what about Muretus at 57.9 and Guarinus at 64.288? 63.92:—*tuos* Usener (1865), Schwabe (1866), Ellis (1867). 64.153:—*iniacta* did not originate with Ellis. 64.282:—Add Housman's *aperit*, a conjecture based on O. Schuster's reference to Ov. *AA* 3.185, which he borrows from Ellis, only bears out what Housman says in *CR*, IV (1890), 340. 64.324:—Correct the reference to *CQ*, IX (1915), 229. 66:—Compare now the text of R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus*, I (Oxford, 1949), 112-23. 71.4:—*certe* belongs to Peiper. 113.2:—*Maeciliam* Lachmann. *P*. 114:—*liquefaciens* and *tepēfaciet* are not examples of diastole.

These criticisms concern details only and are not set down to impugn the general worth of this *liber doctus et laboriosus*.

WENDELL CLAUSEN

Amherst College

*Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der antiken Religionen.* By RUDOLF BULTMANN. Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1949. Pp. 263. Fr. 13.80.

Professor Bultmann's book is an impressive work of condensation of the much belabored theme of the religious origins of Christianity from its Jewish and Hellenistic roots. For wealth of content, clarity of exposition, and aptness of illustration his little volume would be hard to match. Moreover it is not a summary account designed to save the uninitiated reader from the labor of weightier tomes. It is a book with a very definite point of view, which needs, at least in respect to the pages devoted specifically to Christianity, supplementation, if not correction.

No one would question Bultmann's description of early Christianity as a "syncretistic phenomenon." But the central unity of the new syncretism is not sought in the concrete situations of human response to an historic person. Rather the endeavor is made to discover "a uniform, a new and peculiar *Grundauffassung* of human existence." Thus for Bultmann the essential elements of original Christianity are not made up of what Jesus actually did or taught, or what He actually was in His own Person in His historic existence; but they are to be found in the new complex of ideas which faith in the Christ produced in respect to the nature of man and his relation to the cosmos and to God and, in particular, to man's setting in time and eternity. Christianity is therefore a new mythology, developed as such even before the work of St. Paul (for Phil. 2:6-11 is a pre-Pauline "Christ-hymn"):

the chief thing is that *Jesus' Person and work were interpreted with the ideas of the Gnostic salvation-myth*: he is a divine form of the heavenly Light-world, the Son of the Highest, who was sent hither by the Father, veiled in human form, and who brought salvation through his work (p. 219).

Such a central motif is the occasion of Bultmann's arrangement of his material. The first part is an excellent review of the Old Testament inheritance. Then follows

a section on Judaism—chiefly devoted to Pharisaism, though there is a brief chapter on Hellenistic Judaism. Into this part is inserted the discussion of the "Proclamation of Jesus." This is viewed first as a protest against "legalism" and the conception that God's judgment is revealed in *Volks-geschichte*. Since, according to Bultmann, Jesus rejected the "hope" of Judaism in both its nationalistic and its apocalyptic forms, the call of Jesus to men is purely one for an individual decision here and now in face of a Kingdom imminently impending, a Kingdom entirely outside of history. He made no claims to any sort of Messiahship; He was merely the *Verkünder* of the approaching crisis. The Church made Him the *Verkündigte*.

It is significant that Bultmann does not discuss the issues which led to the death of Jesus. Yet it is certainly the Passion narrative (including the Resurrection accounts) which are the focal center of the gospels and of early Christian preaching. But his radical view of Jesus' personal claims for Himself cannot cope with the religious causes of the passion, because it cannot see Jesus' "fulfillment" of Judaism in proper historical perspective. The death and resurrection of Jesus have become merely part of the "mythology" of the early Church.

The third section of the book traces the Greek inheritance, and this is followed by a section on Hellenism, devoted to Stoicism, astralism, the mystery-religions and Gnosticism. This leads into the final section on early Christianity, which is chiefly given over to an exposition of St. Paul and the Fourth Gospel. While it is perfectly true that there is a pre-Christian Gnosticism, we know little of it. And it is a dangerous procedure to explain St. Paul from expressions which later Christian Gnostics developed and systematized. Thus, for example, the characteristic Pauline phrase, "in Christ," is for Bultmann "in no way. . . a formula of mysticism but much more a Gnostic-cosmological formula." In Christ man is freed from the slavery of inimical cosmic powers; though in Paul the "pow-

ers" do not place man in a situation of fate and destiny, but of guilt. And the powers of guilt are: the "flesh," the Law, sin and death.

The foregoing remarks, though chiefly negative, should not be interpreted as a slight to Bultmann's very real achievement. Specialists in Judaism and in Hellenistic religion will doubtless have little criticism of the conclusions reached in these areas. It is the treatment of Christianity which is so individualistic and peculiar. To those already familiar with Bultmann's larger exegetical and theological works his views set forth here will not come as any surprise. But the unwary reader needs to be warned that Bultmann's "mythological" school of thought regarding the beginnings of Christianity is neither new nor is it by any means widely accepted.

MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, JR.

*Episcopal Theological School*

*César, Guerre d'Afrique.* Texte établi et traduit par A. BOUVET. ("Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé.") Paris: Société d'édition "Les belles lettres," 1949. Pp. li + 128.

This is a very satisfactory and useful edition of the *Bellum Africum* with the Latin text and a French translation on opposite pages in the manner of the Loeb Classical Library, but the addition of an extensive introduction, more complete notes, and an *apparatus criticus* make it a much more valuable volume.

The introduction begins with a short account of Caesar's campaign in Africa and continues with an excellent discussion of authorship, style, historical value, and manuscript tradition. With respect to authorship Bouvet rejects Hirtius, Oppius, Asinius Pollio, and Sallust and accepts the more plausible conclusion of Nipperdey and Barwick that both this and the *Bellum Hispaniense* were probably the work of some obscure person writing under the direction of Hirtius. On the basis of litera-

ry style, familiarity with military affairs, and detailed knowledge of the campaign, Bouvet shows convincingly that the account must have been written by an eyewitness, probably an officer of lower rank, who was completely devoted to Caesar and his cause, but who nonetheless has written a reliable account. To support this conclusion he cites several instances where the account reflects the stylistic peculiarities and grammatical irregularities of the common soldier. Finally, the discussion of the manuscripts and the manuscript tradition at the end of the introduction along with the critical notes to the text itself reflect the meticulous and scholarly care devoted to establishing an accurate text.

By following the original as closely as possible, Bouvet facilitates comparison of the French translation with the Latin text. The translation is particularly successful in bringing out the peculiar flavor of the soldiers' speech.

Many will find the notes the most valuable feature of this edition, especially those dealing with military questions and related textual problems. The comments on strategy, the size and identity of army units, as well as his explanations of military terms are excellent. Places mentioned are carefully identified and located, but references to the *Atlas archéologique* and other evidence on topographical matters will usually be found in the *index des noms propres* rather than in the notes.

On political and economic matters the notes are unfortunately much less complete and satisfactory. The explanations of such terms as *conventus civium Romanorum*, *civitas libera et immunis*, and *negotiatores*, for example, fail to bring out their importance in the Romanization of Africa; nor do the notes provide adequate bibliographical guidance for further study. The note to chapter 32, where the document mentions Marius and the Gaetulians favored by him, might include some discussion of clientage and citizenship grants. In connection with chapter 43, where Messius is said to have made a march through the



kingdom of Juba, the note should briefly discuss the boundary question including the *fossa regia*. Since Juba is mentioned frequently in the *Bellum Africum*, it would have been helpful to give the reader a little more information about this king and his kingdom, and his relationship to the Civil War.

On economic affairs, however, the notes offer practically nothing. This is especially regrettable in view of the valuable data in the *Bellum Africum* on agricultural products of the particular areas involved in the campaign, and the villa system of land tenure which prevailed in parts of Africa at that time.

Finally, either in the introduction or in the notes, the historian would expect a more illuminating discussion of the great importance of chapter 97 for a study of the Romans in the African towns, and especially the terms of settlement which Caesar imposed upon Africa after his victory. The distinction between Leptis Minor and Leptis (Leptis Magna) is made clear, but Bouvet seems to be completely unaware that the larger city was called Leptis rather than Leptis at this time. In his note on this chapter, moreover, he states that it was Leptis which was forced to pay the tribute, without informing the reader that opinions differ on this point. (On the spelling Leptis and the reasons for believing that the author of the *Bellum Africum* had Leptis rather than Leptis in mind, see Townsend, "The Oil Tribute of Africa at the Time of Caesar," *CP*, XXXV [1940], 274-83.) Then, too, the implications involved in emending the manuscript readings *irrogatis* or *togatis* to *locatis*, rather than *levatis*, merit more attention.

M. Bouvet is primarily interested in textual criticism and military affairs, and these are unquestionably the most important problems for any editor of the *Bellum Africum*. His sound and careful scholarship in these respects makes this a particularly valuable edition.

PRESCOTT W. TOWNSEND

Indiana University

*Arnobius of Sicca: The Case against the Pagans*. Newly Translated and Annotated by GEORGE E. McCracken. ("Ancient Christian Writers: The Works of the Fathers in Translation," eds. JOHANNES QUASTEN and JOSEPH C. PLUMPE, Nos. 7 and 8.) 2 vols. Westminster, Md.: Newman Bookshop, 1949. Pp. 659. \$ 6.75.

Arnobius, the pagan rhetorician who late in life became a convert to Christianity and composed a book in its defense, is one of the most baffling personalities in the long list of ancient Christian writers. It is obvious that he undertook to champion the Christian cause without any adequate knowledge of Christian doctrines, knowing nothing about the Old Testament and very little about the life and teachings of Christ. Hence he was compelled to limit himself to attacking his former religion; but in that field his encyclopedic knowledge of both Graeco-Roman and Oriental mythology enabled him to produce a devastating exposé of their puerility, inconsistency, and immorality which won him the grudging respect of his new coreligionists. His work was not widely used by subsequent Christian writers, and was not influential in the Middle Ages. Only one manuscript of independent authority (C. Parisinus 1661) is known to exist, and it is in bad condition. At least twenty-eight printed editions of the text have been produced, but even now not all of the disputed readings have been cleared up. The *Adversus nationes* was first translated into English by Hamilton Bryce and Hugh Campbell in 1871 (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. VI, pp. 405-543 [Buffalo, 1886]); but the subsequent publication of improved texts and the critical labors of many scholars have rendered this fine production obsolete. In undertaking to incorporate these fruits of scholarly activity into a new translation Professor McCracken and the editors of the "Ancient Christian Writers" series have done yeoman service to the cause of Christian scholarship.

The work before us is more than a trans-

lation. Professor McCracken has undertaken to shed all possible light on both Arnobius and his book; and in both fields his achievement is outstanding. His fifty-four page introduction summarizes the vague and contradictory data on the author's life, describes his place in the history of Christian literature, traces the manuscript tradition of the *Adversus nationes* in so far as it is known, and briefly sums up the list of modern scholars who have worked upon it. The translation is based principally upon Reifferscheid's text, with occasional readings from Marchesi's edition and others. In general it reproduces the meaning of the original faithfully but not slavishly, in good, unaffected English. In a very few cases the translator seems to have been betrayed into imitating Arnobius' ponderous phrases, but they do not affect the value of his work noticeably. The uncertain state of the text makes it inevitable that there will be differences of opinion on what Arnobius actually said. Thus in 1.50 it would seem that Hildebrand was correct in reading, "nam cum videret futuros suos esse gestarum ab se rerum divinique operis adrogatores . . ." instead of "nam cum videret futuros vos . . . derogatores," which lends more emphasis to the point that Christ avoided the imputation of practicing magic by causing humble men to perform the same miracles as he himself had done. Again, was it necessary to veil the franker parts of Arnobius' discussion of pagan mythology as thickly in circumlocutions as Professor McCracken has done? Certainly our modern taste revolts at some of the filth which Arnobius dragged into the light of day; but Bryce and Campbell handled the story of Aedestis (5.5-7) much more clearly than McCracken has done, without offending sensitive readers.

The notes to this translation are unfortunately relegated to the back part of each volume; but they are ample in quantity and superb in quality. Few indeed are the questions which might arise in a reader's mind on which they will not throw some light. Volume I carries an adequate biblio-

graphy, and Volume II contains a fair index.

C. E. VAN SICKLE

Ohio Wesleyan University

*C. Iuli Caesaris commentarii*, Vol. II: *Commentarii belli civilis*. Edited by ALFRED KLOTZ. 2d ed. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1950, Pp. xxii + 169. \$2.35.

This revision of Klotz's *Commentarii belli civilis* (first edition, 1926) offers several changes besides the new Teubner format and the brief summaries of the narrative at the top of each page. The readings of N, Codex Neapolitanus s. XII/XIII, have been added to the *apparatus* from Fabre's Budé *Guerre civile* (1936). Thus Klotz now lists eight MSS instead of seven (SLTVURW) in his Preface and also cites facsimiles and descriptions in Chatelain and elsewhere. The old stemma, taken over from Holder, has been replaced by a simplified version of Fabre's. The new *Index nominum* has a slightly modified arrangement and one or two corrections.

There is much more material in the Preface to the *editio altera*, though we shall still need that of the first edition for its fuller account of scribal errors. Pp. vii-xiv, dealing with the argument that Caesar did not leave the *Bellum civile* in a finished state, represent pp. ix-xi of the old Preface—expanded mainly to answer Barwick's "Caesars Commentarii und das Corpus Caesarianum" (*Philol.*, Suppl. 31, Heft 2 [1938]). The treatment of the style and syntax of the *Civil War* (pp. xiv-xix) is entirely new and highly interesting. Among the topics taken up are colloquial elements, some peculiarities in case constructions and the verb, and plural nouns for singular. In connection with the last a reference to Löfstedt's "Plural statt des Singulars" (*Syntactica* I<sup>2</sup> [Lund, 1942] 27-65) would have been in order.

The text proper is little changed, except for somewhat more punctuation. In an examination of 65 chapters I have not found a single place where N alone is the

source of a reading. But N occasionally supports what was cited merely as a conjecture in the first recension; cf. 1. 14. 4, where N<sup>c</sup> shows the *circa* which Nipperdey proposed. Again in the revision we note a conservative editorial method full of good sense. At 1. 32. 7 *illis se oneri non futurum* of the MSS—"Man beachte die in dieser Wendung liegende bittere Ironie" (Dobrenz-Dinter *ad loc.*)—is still preferred to Oudendorp's *illi, se oneri non defuturum*. In the case of 2. 24. 1, given the difficulty of identifying the site of Anquillaria, it is surely as sound to keep the *biduique iter* of the codices with Klotz's editions as to emend *bidui-* to *tridui-* with Kübler. The division of the work into two books instead of the traditional three is again followed—with the customary numbering according to three books to match the references in the handbooks and dictionaries.

One textual change indicative of the new grammatical lore in this edition is *redit* for *rediit* (3. 18. 2) and *perit* for *periit* (3. 22. 2) and their interpretation in the *apparatus* as perfects. It might, however, be better to print *redit* and *perit* in the manner of the Budé Livy.

The new *apparatus* gives on the whole more information and in a more compact form. We see that N often has omissions or differs from the other MSS in word order; cf., for example, 1. 19. 4, 3. 51. 5. When something which was in the old *apparatus* has been dropped, the loss, it seems to me, is not great. At 2. 31. 8 *app.*, for instance, to list *ut spe*, the correction of Aldus Manutius II, as Klotz did in 1926, is unnecessary. Caesar certainly used *uti* as well as *ut*, if we can put any faith in the codices (cf. *uti* in §6 of this very chapter), and Meusel's clever construing of *ut ipse* as *uti spe* does not reduce the number of letters involved.

I have noted the following misprints: (p. xvi) read 315 instead of 165 in "Arch. f. lat. Lex. 13 (1904), 165"; (2. 19. 3) the section number 3 is omitted; (3. 44. 5 *app.*) read *quam quae* with the 1926 edition and Meusel's *Tabula coniecturarum* for *quem quae*; (3. 102. 3) read *diutissime* for *ditu-*

*tissime*. In *priusquam telum adigi possit aut nostri propius accederent* (2. 34. 6) the *possit* must be a typographical error, repeated from the earlier edition, for *posset*. Since *possit* is not mentioned in Klotz's *apparatus* either time, one would infer that the MSS have it. But other editors give *posset* without comment. Furthermore, if Klotz had meant to print *possit*, presumably it would have been entered at p. xvii along with the unusual present *solvantur* of *legem promulgavit ut sexenni die sine usuris creditae pecuniae solvantur* (3. 20. 5). For grammatical problems are very carefully considered in the new Preface and *apparatus*. In fact, this edition is one more work of Klotz's showing his great mastery of the matter, text, and language of Caesar.

EDWARD L. BASSETT

University of Washington

---

*Excavations at Gözlü Kule, Tarsus*, Vol. I: *The Hellenistic and Roman Periods*. Edited by HETTY GOLDMAN. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1950. Pp. viii + 420 + pls. and plans bound separately. \$36.00.

Contents: I. Buildings and Habitation Levels (H. Goldman); II. Chronology of the Levels; III. Coins (D. H. Cox); IV. Lamps (H. Goldman and F. F. Jones); V. Stamped Amphora Handles (V. Grace); VI. Pottery (F. F. Jones); VII. Terracotta Figurines (H. Goldman); VIII. Inscriptions (A. E. Raubitschek); IX. Miscellaneous Finds; Stratigraphic Tables of Catalogued Objects; List of Abbreviations; Index.

A short review can hardly do justice to the excellence of this publication, a quality for which all the contributors deserve their shares of credit. Both as a whole and in its separate sections the report is well organized and the material is clearly presented and illustrated for ready reference. The careful recording and description are the more commendable in that the limited area of the excavation produced objects of hardly more than ordinary importance;

as Miss Goldman states in the Foreword, "this volume in no sense represents a study of Hellenistic and Roman Tarsus. That great city lies in large part under the flourishing modern town..." But such restricted and closely controlled digging is far more productive of facts, if not of finds, than more ambitious undertakings, which usually prevent the detailed recording that is a major virtue of this publication.

Two sections deserve special mention. The pottery, the largest and most unwieldy body of material, has been very ably handled by Miss Jones; the text and illustrations give a complete and easily grasped account of the various kinds of both table and kitchen wares. The terracottas form the most interesting body of material and their interest and value has

been appreciated in great measure by Miss Goldman's informative comments. The stratigraphic table of the catalogued objects is a useful addition which should be standard equipment in excavation reports.

It is the cost alone of these volumes that one can object to. Excavation reports have now priced themselves beyond the resources not only of the unsubsidized individual, but also of many college libraries. Perhaps archeologists had better accept the fabric of the Fates and not try to maintain unchanged the high material quality of their publications in an age which has debased that of almost everything else.

F. O. WAAGE

Cornell University

## BOOKS RECEIVED

[Not all works submitted can be reviewed, but those that are sent to the editorial office for notice are regularly listed under "Books Received." Offprints from periodicals and parts of books will not be listed unless they are published (sold) separately. Books submitted are not returnable.]

ABDUL-HAK, SÉLIM, and ANDRÉE. *Catalogue illustré du Département des Antiquités gréco-romaines au Musée de Damas*. ("Publications de la Direction Générale des Antiquités de Syrie.") Damas, 1951. Pp. 180 + 60 pls. + plan.

*Annali della Scuola normale superiore di Pisa, lettere, storia e filosofia*, Ser. II, Vol. XIX (1950), Fasc. III-IV. Firenze: "La nuova Italia" Editrice, 1950. L. 2000 a year.

*Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.*, Vol. I, No. 2 (Fall, 1951). New York: Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., Inc., 1951. \$ 1.50 a copy. \$ 8.00 a year.

BEAZLEY, J. D. *The Development of Attic Black-figure*. ("Sather Classical Lectures," Vol. XXIV.) Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1951. Pp. xiv + 127 + 49 pls. \$ 6.50.

BLANKEN, GERARD. *Les grecs de Cargèse (Corse): Recherches sur leur langue et sur leur histoire*, Vol. I: *Partie linguistique*. Leiden: A. W. Sijthoff's Uitgeversmaatschappij N.V., 1951. Pp. xx + 322. Fl. 17.50.

BLEGEN, CARL W.; CASKEY, JOHN L.; and RAWSON, MARION. *Troy: The Third, Fourth, and Fifth Settlements*, Vol. II, Part 1: *Text*; Part 2: *Plates*. Princeton: Princeton University Press (for the University of Cincinnati), 1951. Pp. xxii + 325; xxiv + 318 ills. \$ 36.00.

BREITENBACH, HANS RUDOLF. *Historiographische Anschauungsformen Xenophons*. (Dissertation, Basel.) Freiburg in der Schweiz: Paulusdruckerei, 1950. Pp. 159.

DODDS, E. R. *The Greeks and the Irrational*. ("Sather Classical Lectures," Vol. XXV.) Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1951. Pp. xii + 327. \$5.00.

EHRENBERG, VICTOR. *The People of Aristophanes: A Sociology of Old Attic Comedy*. 2d ed. rev. and enl. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951. Pp. xx + 418 + 19 pls. \$ 5.00.

ERNOUT A., and MEILLET, A. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: Histoire des mots*, Vol. II: *M-Z et Index*. 3d ed. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1951. Pp. 668-1385.

- FARQUHARSON, A. S. L. *Marcus Aurelius: His Life and His World*. Edited by D. A. REES. New York: William Salloch, 1951. Pp. viii + 154 + 1 pl. \$ 2.00.
- FRÄNKEL, HERMANN. *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums: Eine Geschichte der griechischen Literatur von Homer bis Pindar*. ("Philological Monographs," published by the American Philological Association, ed., JOHN L. HELLER, No. XIII.) New York: American Philological Association, 1951. Pp. xii + 680. Order through Lancaster Press, Inc. (Lancaster, Pa.) and B. H. Blackwell, Ltd. (Oxford).
- GOHEEN, ROBERT F. *The Imagery of Sophocles' Antigone: A Study of Poetic Language and Structure*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1951. Pp. 171. \$ 3.00.
- Hermathena*, No. LXXVII (May, 1951). Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co.; London: Longmans, Green & Co. 3 s.
- HOHL, ERNST. *Um Arminius: Biographie oder Legerde?* (Sitzungsberichte der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Gesellschaftswissenschaften, No. 1 [1951].) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1951. Pp. 27. DM 2.10.
- JOHNSON, ALLAN CHESTER. *Egypt and the Roman Empire*. ("The Jerome Lectures," Second Series.) Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1951. Pp. viii + 183. \$ 3.50.
- KELLEHER, PATRICK J. *The Holy Crown of Hungary*. ("Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome," Vol. XIII.) Rome: American Academy in Rome, 1951. Pp. xii + 124 + 36 pls.
- KNIGHT, W. F. JACKSON. *Accentual Symmetry in Vergil*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell; New York: MacMillan Co., 1950. Pp. x + 108 + table. \$ 1.50.
- LA PENNA, ANTONIO. *Propertio: Saggio critico seguito da due ricerche filologiche*. ("Studi di lettere, storia, e filosofia," pubblicati dalla Scuola normale superiore di Pisa, Vol. XXIII.) Firenze: "La nuova Italia" Editrice, 1951. Pp. viii + 201.
- LOENEN, JOHANNES HUBERTUS MATHIAS MARIE. *De Nous in het Systeem van Plato's Philosophie*. (Dissertation, Amsterdam, 1951.) Amsterdam: Jasonpers; Universiteitspers, 1951. Pp. viii + 297.
- MADDALENA, ANTONIO. *Thucydidis Historiarum liber primus: Introduzione, testo critico e commento con traduzione e indici*. ("Biblioteca di studi superiori," Vol. XV.) Firenze: "La nuova Italia" Editrice, 1951. Pp. lxxxvi + 95.
- DE MONTMOLLIN, DANIEL. *La poétique d'Aristote: Texte primitif et additions ultérieures*. (Dissertation, Neuchâtel.) Neuchâtel: H. Messeiller, 1951. Pp. 375.
- MYLONAS, GEORGE E. (ed.). *Studies Presented to David Moore Robinson on his Seventieth Birthday*, Vol. I. St. Louis, Mo.: Washington University, 1951. Pp. lxx + 876 + 111 pls. + figs. in text. \$ 25.00.
- NEUGEBAUER, KARL ANTON. *Die griechischen Bronzen der klassischen Zeit und des Hellenismus*. Edited by CARL BLÜMEL. (Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Katalog der statuarischen Bronzen im Antiquarium, Vol. II.) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1951. Pp. 110 + 40 pls. DM 32.50.
- SCRANTON, ROBERT L. *Monuments in the Lower Agora and North of the Archaic Temple. (Corinth: Results of the Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Vol. I, Part III.)* Princeton, N. J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1951. Pp. xvi + 200 + 83 figs. in text + 76 pls. + folding pls. A-O. \$ 10.00.
- SUNDWALL, JOH. *Kleinasiatische Nachträge*. ("Studia orientalia," edidit Societas orientalis Fennica, Vol. XVI, No. 1.) Helsinki, 1950. Pp. 50. Mk. 208; \$ 0.90.
- WILKINS, ERNEST H. *The Prose Letters of Petrarch: A Manual*. New York: S. F. Vanni, 1951. Pp. 143. \$ 4.50.
- ZILLIACUS, HENRIK. *Untersuchungen zu den abstrakten Anredeformen und Höflichkeitstiteln im Griechischen*. ("Societas scientiarum Fennica, Commentationes humanarum litterarum," Vol. XV, No. 3.) Helsingfors: Nordische Antikvarische Buchhandlung; Akademische Buchhandlung, 1949. Pp. 111. Mk. 330.



m,  
er-

ri-  
sto  
ci.  
V.)  
51.

d'  
ér.  
u-

re-  
ia  
o.:  
+

ni-  
es  
L.  
er  
n,  
l.

he  
ic  
z-  
f  
rt  
of  
ri  
l-

.  
l-  
i,

f  
.

4

-

-

-

)

o

.